DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 904 CE 020 145

AUTHOR	Jernigan, Joan Shirley; Clark, Donald L.
TITLE	Assisting Handicapped Stulents in Vocational Technical Programs in Community Colleges. Identification of Barriers; Recommendations for Removal of Barriers; Tasks to be Implemented. Summary Report.
INSTITUTION	Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Texas Education Agency, Austin. Dept. of Occupational Education and Technology.
PUB DATE	Nov 78
CONTRACT	TEA-892300 66
NOTE	77p.; Not available in hard copy due to small print; For a related document see CE 020 146
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Access to Education; *Community Colleges; Educational Research; *Handicapped Students; Policy Formation; *Programing Problems; Program Planning; Task Analysis; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Texas

ABSTRACT

A policy-focus Delphi study was conducted to identify the barriers which prohibit handicapped students from entering or completing vocational technical programs in community colleges in Texas and to identify recommendations and tasks relating to the removal of these barriers. A seventy-two member participant group, which included a nineteen member steering committee, identified 29 tasks which might be implemented or considered for policy formulation by community colleges. These 29 tasks resulted from a content analysis and distillation of the group's 351 recommendations which had evolved from their 198 identified barriers. Fourteen of the 29 tasks correlated with 18 barriers identified by a majoritity (66%) of the participants as being the most severe. Ratios of desirability, feasibility, and cost effectiveness of implementing the tasks were derived and verified by the steering committee. (The appendix, which is the bulk of the document, lists in tabular format the barriers, recommendations, and ratings of barrier severity and implementation feasibility.) (JH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ASSISTING HANDICAPPED STUDENTS IN VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL PROGRAMS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Identification of Barriers

Recommendations for Removal of Barriers

Tasks to Be Implemented

A Summary Report with Recommendations for Implementation of the Study

Performed in cooperation with the

Division of Occupational Research and Development
Department of Occupational Education and Technology
Texas Education Agency

and the

College of Education
Texas A&M University

TEA Contract No. 89230066

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

Joan Shirley Jernigan
Principal Investigator

Donald L. Clark
Professor and Project Director
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Jernigan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

November 1978

The research report herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Division of Occupational Research and Development, Department of Occupational Education and Technology, Texas Education Agency, TEA Contract No. 89230066. Contractors or Grantees undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Department of Occupational Education and Technology position or policy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to express appreciation to the Research Coordinating Unit, Department of Occupational Education and Technology, Texas Education Agency, for the provision of funds to complete this research. Without such support it would have been impossible to conduct the study.

The actual success of the study was due to the valuable contributions made by the seventy-two member participant group, which included the nineteen member steering committee. Each of the participants was sincerely interested in assisting the handicapped student in succeeding in community college vocational/technical programs, and because of this dedication, contributions made by this group far exceeded the usual contributions made by participants of a research study.

Members of the steering committee set the pace and supported the project director and principal investigator to the very end of the study. Although it is impossible to name all of the members of the participant group, members of the steering committee were as follows: Stanton Calvert, Texas Coolege Coordinating Board; Paul Clayton, Paris Junior College; Howard Duhon, Lee Community College; Elizabeth (Buffy) Fetter, Eastfield Community College; Lynn Hill, San Antonio Junior College; Bettye Lacy, Fort Sam Houston I.S.D.; Paul Lindsey, Southwest Texas State University; Curtis T. Liston, Texas State Technical Institute; Eleanor Mikulin, Special Education, Texas Education Agency; Jamieson H. B. Newell, San Antonio Junior College; Rue Tillery, Fort Sam Houston I.S.D., Ron Trull, Texas Rehabilitation Commission; Sue Yoselow, El Centro Community College; Gilmore Williams, Austin Community College; and Troy Williamson, Paris Junior College. Two other members, William Henderson, Management Services Associates and Roland A. H. Benson, Postsecondary Programs, Occupational Education and Technology, Texas Education Agency, moved out of the state before the research was completed, but they were most helpful in the early part of the study.

A special note of thanks is due to Marjorie Hanson, who assisted in the analyses of the data. Thanks is also due to Sandra Patterson, the part-time project secretary, and a student in Biomedical Science at Texas A&M, who typed all hours of the day and night to get out questionnaires and meet deadlines.

Much supportive assistance was provided by Texas A&M professors, Walter F. Stenning, Educational Curriculum and Instruction, James F. McNamara, Interdisciplinary Education, and John Donald Williams, Veterinary Public Health.

Finally, the greatest note of thanks goes to Dr. Donald L. Clark, the Project Director, without whose guidance, patience and constructive criticism this project would not have come to a successful close.

Joan Shirley Jernigan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction 1

Summary of Study 2

Purpose 2

Procedures and Analysis of Data 3

Conclusions 8

Recommendations for Implementation of the Findings 11

References 17

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Criteria for Successful Completion of Vocational Technical Programs	5
II	Final Ratings of Desirability, Feasibiltiy and Cost Effectiveness of Performing Tasks to Remove Barriers	12
III	Cross Tabulation of Barriers Rated Very Severe and Moderately Severe by 66% of Respondents by the Task(s) Necessary for Removal of the Barriers as Identified by Table IV	14
IV	Barriers Rated Most Severe by 66% or More of Respondents	15
V	Priority Tasks to be Implemented	16

ASSISTING HANDICAPPED STUDENTS IN VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL PROGRAMS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Aided by increased federal legislation, handicapped citizens are becoming more assertive and are seeking more active social roles. One is the role of the student. Due to this trend, the numbers of handicapped adults seeking education will expand significantly (Shworles, 1977). Another trend, "normalization", is a movement to assist the handicapped persons to function in the mainstream of society by increasing their ability to cope, and changing the perception of society toward the handicapped. "Normalization" also means assisting the handicapped person to function in educational programs available to the nonhandicapped (Phillips, Carmel and Renzullo, 1977). These trends have created pressures on educators to provide handicapped adults with the vocational skills that will assist them in becoming independent members of society.

In response to these pressures, a study was conducted which attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the barriers within the school setting (other than architectural) that keep handicapped students from entering or from completing vocational training in community colleges?
2. How severe are the barriers?
3. What are the tasks necessary for removing the barriers?
4. Which recommendations can be considered most feasible to implement?
5. How do the ratings of feasibility for removing barriers by

"experts" compare to the ratings by "consumers" or handicapped students?

6. What is the criteria for successfully completing a community college vocational program by a handicapped student?

The primary goal of the study was to identify the barriers which prohibited handicapped students from entering or completing vocational programs, and to identify the critical tasks necessary to overcome these barriers. Information resulting from this study has been used to develop this handbook which should assist community college teachers, counselors and administrators, as well as agencies such as the Texas Education Agency, the Texas Rehabilitation Commission, and the Commission for the Blind in implementing programs or services to help handicapped students successfully complete vocational training programs at the community college level.

Summary of Study

The purpose of the study, and the procedures and analysis of the data are summarized in the following paragraphs.

Purpose

The primary purpose of this study was to identify the barriers which prohibited handicapped students from entering or completing vocational technical programs in community colleges in Texas. Recommendations regarding the removal of these barriers were also identified by participants of the study, and finally the critical tasks necessary to overcome these barriers were identified.

Procedures and Analysis of Data

The principal research technique was a policy focus Delphi study in which informed judgments were solicited from experienced specialists or "experts". Initial participants included members of a 19 member steering committee who also provided input at various decision points in the study. The steering committee nominated fifty-three additional specialists, each associated in some manner with community colleges in Texas. These participants included handicapped students, teachers and instructors, teacher trainers, administrators in agencies which serve the handicapped, counselors, administrators in community colleges, agency consultants, persons engaged in transportation of the handicapped, a member of the college coordinating board, a clinical psychologist, a research psychologist, a public school administrator, and a vocational adjustment coordinator.

Few related research studies were found in the course of a literature review. However, as a result of contacting each state department of education in the United States and its territories, eleven research reports and eleven reports of related projects were received and reviewed for the study. Most reports were as recent as 1977 or 1978, which indicated that research and projects were probably responding to recent legislation for the handicapped.

The Round One questionnaire requesting identification of barriers was mailed to the particpants. In addition, seven criteria which had been identified by the steering committee as the criteria for successfully completing vocational technical programs by handicapped students

selection. Particpants' selections are presented in Table I. Also included was a request for identifying information regarding employment role, handicapping condition, if any, and the participant's knowledge of and relationship to handicapped students. Participants submitted 402 barriers which were then combined and condensed into 198 barriers to be presented in Round Two.

In the Round Two questionnaire the participants were requested to rate the severity of the barriers on a scale of one through four, and make recommendations for removing the barriers rated very severe and moderately severe.

Eleven barriers rated most severe by 60 participants were analyzed according to the participant's employment role. Participants in all positions found the barriers to be more severe than the handicapped students and the persons engaged in transporting the handicapped.

From an analysis of the participant's handicapping condition (orthopedic, deaf/hearing impaired, sight impaired, respiratory, blind and no handicapping condition), it was found that 70% of the orthopedically handicapped participants considered only one barrier to be severe: "Lack of knowledge of what students can do resulting in negative attitudes toward the limitations of the handicapped students."

The relative frequency (percent) of how the participants rated the barriers and the mean scores were presented to the particpants in Round Three. They were asked to examine the frequency ratings of the barriers, mark any mean score they thought was too high or too low, and explain why they disagreed with the score.

TABLE I

CRITERIA FOR SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL PROGRAMS

Criteria	Numbers of Participants Selecting Criterion*
Acquisition of sufficient job skills to become successfully employed	48
Acquisition of sufficient skills to live a productive self-sufficient life	39
Acquisition of sufficient skills to compete in the world of work with non-disabled individuals with similar training	38
Sufficient acquisition of skills to meet personal, individual goals	33
Certification in the technical area for which the student is trained	30
Successful employment to the maximum potential of the person's earning power	29
Completion of an associate degree	17
Other Criteria	
Acquisition of interpersonal relationships with employers and employees	1
Maintaining employment in the related field of training	1

N = 67

* Participants could select more than one criterion

Barriers and recommendations for removing those barriers were analyzed during the second part of the study. Each participant was asked to rate the feasibility of implementing the recommendations on a scale of one through five. The questionnaire was also distributed to consumers (handicapped vocational technical students in community colleges) selected by Texas Rehabilitation Counselors. Through Wilks' Lambda Test of Significance the participants' answers were compared to the students' answers, and findings were that in all but five of 351 recommendations there were no significant differences between the groups. Four of the five differences were found in the section, "Barriers Within the Handicapped Person, Their Families and Other Advocates." The students believed the recommendations were more feasible than the participants.

Barriers, recommendations for removing the barriers, ratings of both the severity of the barriers and of the feasibility of recommendations for removing barriers and comments regarding the barriers are presented in the table in the appendix. Each of the 198 barriers is listed under the following three large classifications, and subclassifications.

Barriers Within the Helping System

- Legislation
- Planning and Preparation
- Attitudes of Community College Personnel
- Attitudes of Non-Disabled Students
- Preservice and Inservice Education
- Prevocational Training
- Vocational Instructional Programs and Services
- Vocational Materials and Equipment
- Research
- Counseling, Placement and Followup
- Student Accounting System
- Lack of Financial Resources

Barriers Within the Society

Lack of Knowledge About the Helping System
Attitudinal Barriers
Inadequate Leadership
Media Barriers
Transportation
Employment Barriers
Architectural Barriers Off Campus
Competing Demands

Barriers Within the Handicapped Person, Their Families and Other Advocates

Handicapped Persons: Physical/Mental/Emotional Problems
Handicapped Persons: Lack of Knowledge
Handicapped Persons: Behavioral Barriers
Negative Attitudes and Feelings
Family Members
Barriers Within Advocates for Handicapped Persons

Recommendations for removal of barriers are listed under each related barrier. Numbers of recommendations under each barrier vary from no recommendations to as many as five recommendations.

Sixty respondents rated the severity of the barriers. These are presented by percentages in the second column of the table.

The participants also rated the feasibility of implementing recommendations, as indicated by percentages of the third column. The numbers of respondents who rated each item is beside the percentage figure. Each participant rated one-third of the recommendations for the removal of barriers.

The comments of the respondents registering disagreement with the ratings of severity of the barriers are summarized in the last two columns of the table. Respondents often limited comments to "too low" or "too nigh". The figures in parenthesis represent the number of respondents who disagreed on the ratings. Although comments

were of interest, it appeared that the number of comments and disagreements with ratings were not of sufficient number of magnitude to change the ratings of severity.

Through a content analysis of the recommendations which had evolved from 198 barriers, 29 tasks were identified which might result in policy formation or might be implemented by community colleges, agencies, or advocates for the handicapped. Ratings of desirability, feasibility and cost effectiveness of implementing the tasks were derived and verified by the steering committee. The 29 tasks and ratings formed the basis for conclusions which have been drawn from this study (Table II). Fourteen of the 29 tasks which correlated with 18 barriers identified by a majority (66%) of the participants as being most severe provided the data base for the recommendations derived from this study.

Conclusions

Since all of the findings obtained from the policy focus Delphi Rounds were considered results of the study, it is difficult to present a detailed summary of the conclusions. However, in addition to the identification of the most severe barriers which impede successful completion of vocational technical programs at the post-secondary level by handicapped individuals, and recommended tasks to remove these barriers, several conclusions can be drawn from the study.

1. Seven criteria regarding the successful completion of vocational technical programs by the handicapped were identified by the steering committee and rated

by participants. Each criterion, considered separately, was believed to indicate successful completion of a program. The criterion selected by 48 of the 72 participants as the most indicative of successful completion of vocational technical programs was "acquisition of sufficient job skills to become successfully employed."

2. Based on the data collected, "experts" who had knowledge of handicapped students in post-secondary programs indicated that there were numerous barriers which the handicapped encounter and that these barriers are both broad and specific in nature.
3. After analyzing responses of participants by employment, it was found that handicapped students and the participants engaged in the transporation of the handicapped considered the barriers to be less severe than did the other participants of the study, and the orthopedically handicapped did not find the barriers as severe as other participants with other disabilities or with no disabilities identified.
4. In only five instances, participants and consumers rated the feasibility of implementing recommendations to remove barriers differently; therefore, the populations were considered congruent.
5. Based on the results of the literature review and the findings of the study, 29 tasks were identified

as those needed to assist handicapped students in entering and completing vocational technical programs in the community colleges in Texas. Although some of these tasks are currently being implemented, and policies have been formulated in some areas, the results of the study indicated that there is need to continue to improve and increase whatever efforts exist. The identified tasks are considered a major yield of the study and are presented in Table II, with a suggested rating of desirability, feasibiltiy, and cost effectiveness for each task. The tasks are in rank order according to the number of recommendations which were identified as those supporting the task.

6. An analysis of the identified tasks compared to barriers which were rated as most severe was conducted. Fourteen of the 29 tasks were found to be related to the 18 barriers which were rated by at least 66% of participants as being very severe or moderately severe (Table III). The 18 barriers considered most severe are presented in Table IV. The 14 tasks which related to these barriers are presented in Table V. It is recommended that the 14 tasks presented be considered as priority tasks to be implemented since each is related to one or more barriers considered most severe.

Recommendations for Implementation of the Findings

Local community colleges throughout the State of Texas may utilize the findings of this study to assist handicapped students in vocational technical programs. It is recommended the community college administrators review the 29 tasks to be implemented or considered for policy formulation and examine their applicability at the local level with special consideration given to the 14 priority tasks which emerged from the study. Each local community college should identify tasks to be implemented which are pertinent to their institution, and should develop a timetable for implementing the identified tasks.

An additional application of the study by instructors, counselors and administrators would be that of identifying barriers in local programs of vocational technical instruction. It is recommended that persons responsible for the education of the handicapped review the 198 barriers in the summary table in the appendix to determine the extent of barriers prohibiting the education of the handicapped in vocational technical programs in the local community college. Finally, the detailed recommendations for removal of barriers listed under each barrier in the summary table should be reviewed in planning successful programs of instruction for handicapped students.

TABLE II

FINAL RATINGS OF DESIRABILITY, FEASIBILITY AND COST EFFECTIVENESS OF PERFORMING TASKS TO REMOVE BARRIERS

Key to ratings:

Desirability:
1 - very desirable
2 - desirable
3 - undesirable
4 - very undesirable

Feasibility:
1 - definitely feasible
2 - possibly feasible
3 - possibly unfeasible
4 - definitely unfeasible

Cost Effectiveness:
1 - very cost effective
2 - possibly cost effective
3 - possibly not cost effective
4 - definitely not cost effective

General Tasks to be Performed	Number of Recommendations Related to Task	Rating of Desirability to Perform Task	Rating of Feasibility to Perform Task	Rating of Cost Effectiveness for Performing Task
1. Provide for improved and increased counseling services.	48	1	1	1
2. Establish inservice programs for the vocational technical and academic community college personnel.	42	1	1	1
3. Secure funding to provide for programs, services, facilities and equipment.	26	1	1	1
4. Provide resource persons and support services to assist instructors and students.	24	1	1	1
5. Plan for individual students.	24	1	1	1
6. Provide special materials or programs to accommodate handicapped.	22	1	1	2
7. Conduct public education regarding the needs of the handicapped utilizing the news media.	16	1	1	1
8. Provide individualized instruction with planned scope and sequence of curriculum and open entry/exit points for students.	14	1	1	1
9. Conduct research in areas of needs assessment, employment, materials, and equipment.	12	1	2	2
10. Provide pre-service training and teacher preparation in colleges and universities.	12	1	1	1
11. Coordinate services with employers in business and industry.	10	1	2	1
12. Obtain special or adapted equipment.	10	1	2	2

Table II cont.

General Tasks to be Performed	Number of Recommendations Related to Task	Rating of Desirability to Perform Task	Rating of Feasibility to Perform Task	Rating of Cost Effectiveness for Performing Task
13. Improve communication and coordination of services between vocational technical programs and agencies.	10	1	2	1
14. Obtain legislative support.	9	1	1	1
15. Enlist improved and increased services from the Texas Rehabilitation Commission.	8	1	2	2
16. Provide for increased interaction between handicapped and non-handicapped students.	8	1	1	2
17. Develop a centralized system of resources.	7	1	1	2
18. Identify instructors' responsibilities for handicapped students.	6	2	2	2
19. Provide special materials and curriculum.	6	1	2	2
20. Develop policies to provide programs and assistance for the handicapped.	5	1	1	2
21. Develop administrative planning for the handicapped.	4	1	2	2
22. Expand and develop programs of vocational education.	4	1	2	2
23. Develop career information for the handicapped.	4	1	1	1
24. Articulate community college vocational technical programs of instruction with public schools.	4	1	1	1
25. Solicit assistance from the community	4	2	2	2
26. Teach handicapped students to communicate problems and use resources available.	3	2	2	1
27. Develop a method of accountability.	1	1	1	1
28. Develop programs for deaf students.	1	2	2	2
29. Establish advocacy groups.	1	2	2	2

TABLE III

CROSS TABULATION OF BARRIERS RATED VERY SEVERE AND MODERATELY SEVERE BY 66% OR MORE OF RESPONDENTS BY THE TASK(S) NECESSARY FOR REMOVAL OF THE BARRIERS AS IDENTIFIED BY TABLE IV

Barriers (Percent of Participants) (see Table IV)	Identified Task to be Implemented (see Table II																												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30 (78.0)		1								1										1									
28 (73.3)										1																			
34 (72.9)		1												1															
24 (72.8)		1																											
71 (71.9)			1																										
31 (71.7)		1		1																									
27 (71.7)		1																											
15 (71.2)		1								1																			
85 (69.0)	1	1																											
87 (68.4)										1													1						
67 (68.4)			1														1												
132 (67.9)							1				1																		
23 (67.8)																1													
134 (66.7)			1																										
32 (66.1)		1							1																				
88 (66.1)	1												1																
12 (66.0)		1																		1									
82 (66.0)									1	1																			
Number of Barriers Related to Each Task	2	9	3	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE IV

BARRIERS RATED MOST SEVERE BY
66% OR MORE OF RESPONDENTS

Barrier Number	Barrier	Percent of Participants Selecting Barrier
30	Lack of programs to prepare post-secondary instructors to teach the handicapped.	78.0%
23	Lack of orientation to receptive expressive language deficiencies and the need for specialized language instruction.	73.3%
34	Lack of counseling and teaching skills needed to accommodate the handicapped student's uniqueness.	72.9%
24	Lack of general knowledge of the handicapped and handicapping conditions.	72.8%
71	Lack of funds to provide for special expenses such as special equipment.	71.9%
31	Instructors inadequately trained in techniques to assist the handicapped student to adapt standard procedures to meet his requirements.	71.7%
27	Inadequate staff preparation and orientation toward working with handicapped students in the area of various learning modalities.	71.7%
15	Lack of knowledge of what students can do resulting in negative attitudes toward the limitations of the handicapped student.	71.2%
85	Lack of realistic counseling and goal setting.	69.0%
87	Inadequate prevocational exploration background information and exposure to the world of work.	68.4%
67	Lack of adaptable equipment that will facilitate teaching the handicapped.	68.4%
132	Employers are unwilling to accept handicapped persons in their employ due to lack of sufficient information regarding handicapping conditions.	67.9%
23	Inadequate orientation of non-handicapped students as to how they may better understand and assist handicapped students.	67.8%
134	Buildings are inaccessible because they are not barrier free (housing for students).	66.7%
32	Lack of knowledge of and sensitivity to handicapping conditions in planning, implementing, and evaluating instruction and vocational learner outcomes.	66.1%
88	Lack of adequate evaluation and diagnosis before making career decisions.	66.1%
12	Lack of skilled interpreters for the deaf in all classes including vocational technical classes.	66.0%
82	An unwillingness on the part of the academic community at the Administrative and Board level to aggressively research the needs of the handicapped in their district--low budget priority.	66.0%

TABLE V

PRIORITY TASKS TO BE IMPLEMENTED

Task Number	Task	Related Barriers
2	Establish inservice programs for the vocational technical and academic community college personnel.	30, 34, 24, 31, 27, 15, 85, 32, 12
10	Provide pre-service training and teacher preparation in colleges and universities.	30, 28, 15, 87, 82
3	Secure funding to provide for programs, services, facilities and equipment.	71, 67, 134
1	Provide for improved and increased counseling services.	48, 85, 88
20	Develop policies to provide programs and assistance for the handicapped.	30, 12
4	Provide resource persons and support services to assist instructors and students.	31
7	Conduct public education regarding the capabilities and needs of the handicapped utilizing the news media.	132
9	Conduct research in areas of need assessment, employment, materials and equipment.	82
11	Coordinate services with employers in business and industry.	132
13	Improve communication and coordination of services between vocational technical programs and agencies.	88
14	Obtain legislative support.	34
16	Provide for increased interaction between handicapped students.	23
17	Develop a centralized system of resources.	67
23	Develop career information for the handicapped.	87

REFERENCES

Phillips, Linda, Carmel, Larry, and Renzullo, Remo. Barriers and Bridges. Sacramento, California: California Advisory Council on Vocational Education, 1977.

Shworles, Thomas R. Guidelines for program operation: A focus on principals. Proceedings of the disabled student on American campuses: Service and the state of the art. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, August, 1977.

APPENDIX

A SUMMARY OF THE SEVERITY OF BARRIERS FOR THE HANDICAPPED AND FEASIBILITY OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO REMOVE BARRIERS

A SUMMARY OF THE SEVERITY OF BARRIERS FOR THE HANDICAPPED

AND FEASIBILITY OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO REMOVE BARRIERS

In the first column, barriers are listed (example: 1.0) as well as the recommendations for removing these barriers (example: 1.1).

The second column reports how respondents rated the severity of each barrier: 1 being very severe, 2 being moderately severe, 3 being slightly severe, 4 being not severe and no response (NR). The column includes the percentages.

The third column reports how feasible the respondents judged the recommendations to be, 1 being definitely feasible, 2 being feasible, 3 being possibly feasible, 4 being possibly unfeasible, 5 being definitely unfeasible. Each member was randomly assigned to only 1/3 of the recommendations. The column includes the rating scale, the percentages and numbers of respondents.

The last two columns report the respondents' comments about the severity of barriers. Respondents often limited their comments to "too low" or "too high". Numbers in parentheses indicate the numbers of respondents.

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
BARRIERS WITHIN THE HELPING SYSTEM												
Legislation												
1.0 A general lack of knowledge in the academic community of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973	11.7	38.3	41.7	8.3	0						1.0 (6) Community College Personnel need more awareness of this act. There is a need to support legislation for credible enforcement. Needs to be more information and attitudinal change regarding 504.	
1.1 Inform via workshops, printed material, administrative policy.						61.5	30.8	7.7	0	0 N = 13		
1.2 Each organization should adopt policies to implement locally.						38.5	15.4	30.8	7.7	7.7 N = 13		
1.3 Legislators should be requested to make wording less difficult						15.4	23.1	23.1	38.5	0 N = 13		
1.4 Communicate and disseminate through news media.						38.5	23.1	15.4	23.1	0 N = 13		
1.5 Provide orientation seminars on the nature and effect of Section 504 for key administrative personnel.						30.8	69.2	0	0	0 N = 13		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY BY IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	NR	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
2.0 Social Security Disability Insurance legislation which inhibits initiative to prepare for employment	12.7	34.5	45.5	7.3	5						2.0 (10) SSDI can and does inhibit motivation. Benefits could be modified to both maintain security and promote employment, however, it is extremely difficult to convince someone drawing social security that would be better off without it. Legislation needs to be amended to create more incentive for people to get back to work.	2.0 (1) Should be rated less severe.
2.1 Make these funds available for vocational education.						45.5	18.2	27.3	0	9.1 N = 11		
2.2 Remove earnings limitations.						36.4	27.3	9.1	27.3	0 N = 11		
2.3 Provide yearly interviews by rehabilitation counselors.						45.5	36.4	9.1	9.1	0 N = 11		
Planning and Preparation												
3.0 Inadequate planning on the part of the administrative staff for individual student needs of the handicapped such as language barriers.	21.7	45.0	26.7	6.7	0						3.0 (9) This is the most essential step in providing adequate programs for handicapped students. Should be rated very severe. Should be higher. Organizational action, i.e., change begins at the top (usually). Problems exist so responsibility for correction lies with administration which is not doing much at this point.	3.0 (1)
3.1 Establish inservice training for community college administrators.						33.3	33.3	25.0	0	8.3 N = 12		
3.2 Establish an affirmative action program to include handicapped students.						16.7	50.0	8.3	16.7	8.3 N = 12		
3.3 Include this type of assistance in curriculum.						18.2	27.3	45.5	0	9.1 N = 11		

Table IV - Continued

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATION	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
											RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5		
.0 General lack of communication between helping agencies and the training institution.	20.0	36.7	41.7	1.7	0						4.0 (9) Agencies do not communicate efficiently, therefore, administrators and students do not know of help that is available. Should be rated more severe because of 1) complexity, 2) overlaps of responsibility for the funding process and 3) lack of involvement in professional rehabilitation process. Emphasis should be on the client.	4.0 (3) Too high.
4.1 Assign a liaison person to each community college						41.7	33.3	8.3	16.7	0		
						N = 12						
4.2 Establish interagency committees to provide for more exchange of information.						50.0	8.3	25.0	16.7	0		
						N = 12						
4.3 Provide information in preservice training at colleges and universities						50.0	25.0	25.0	0	0		
						N = 12						
.0 Too few certified rehabilitation counselors on campuses of the training institution.	20.0	38.3	26.7	15.0	0						5.0 (8) More qualified counselors need to give in-depth service.	5.0 (2) Problem not severe enough to warrant consideration.
5.1 Establish some type of funding formula to assure an adequate ratio of rehabilitation counselors to students.						25.0	50.0	16.7	8.3	0		
						N = 12						
5.2 Make the job of counselor more attractive to new or prospective counselors.						25.0	50.0	16.7	8.3	0		
						N = 12						
5.3 Provide the "common client" concept where various institutions pool resources and focus on a common client.						16.7	16.7	58.3	0	8.3		
						N = 12						
.0 Lack of organizational structures which insure meaningful interaction between handicapped and nondisabled students	10.0	30.0	41.7	18.3	0						6.0 (8) Administrators must take action to insure that nondisabled become involved. Better understanding of handicapped individual situation is essential to assist the removal of attitudinal barriers.	6.0 (3)
6.1 All programs should be designed to avoid lack of integrated activities.						25.0	8.3	41.7	25.0	0		
						N = 12						

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
6.2 Seek specific kinds of commitments and actions from top administrative staff.						12.5	12.5	75.0	0	0		
						N = 8						
7.0 Poor planning and organization which results in social barriers, i.e., inability to participate in concerts, hear speakers or attend films.	11.9	32.2	40.7	15.3	1						7.0 (8) Should be recognized as more severe. Buildings are inaccessible. Emotional, recreational, social well being of both handicapped and non-handicapped depend on an integrated setting in school and in employment later.	7.0 (4)
7.1 Lack of planning is not usually intentional, therefore, policy statements and written reminders should be implemented.						33.3	41.7	25.0	0	0		
						N = 12						
7.2 Conduct workshops and in-service training to plan and organize to assist the handicapped in participating in social events						33.3	50.0	8.3	8.3	0		
						N = 12						
8.0 Lack of planning for required activities which are difficult for handicapped students such as registration.	11.7	36.7	38.3	13.3	0						8.0 (9) Physical handicaps get attention, but language learning disabled students or hard of hearing students have huge problems in this area. Special accommodations should be made for handicapped people.	8.0 (6) Not severe - most institutions know the situation.
8.1 All agencies should cooperate in making recommendations to school officials.						50.0	25.0	8.3	16.7	0		
						N = 12						
8.2 Plan a different procedure for disabled students.						41.7	33.3	8.3	0	16.7		
						N = 12						
9.0 Inadequate availability of readers, interpreters, tutors and counselors for handicapped students.	20.3	44.1	22.0	13.6	1						9.0 (11) This service makes the difference between students being able to complete programs or not.	9.0 (3) Rehabilitation commissions provide funds for these services when need is recognized.
9.1 Develop a system for vocational resources similar to the Texas Learning Resource Center network, to locate all available resources.						36.4	54.5	9.1	0	0		
						N = 11						

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondent
9.2 Secure funding for such positions on community college campuses.						25.0	25.0	41.7	8.3	0 N = 12		
9.3 Establish training programs for these helpers.						41.7	41.7	16.7	0	0 N = 12		
10.0 Lack of funds for support services and staff (i.e., wheelchairs, pushers, attendants, note-takers, interpreters, tutors, etc.)	20.7	41.4	27.6	10.3	2						10.0 (10) There is not enough staff to meet the needs of the handicapped (include typists). Additional funding is needed to add staff and services. Will become more severe if current court cases put responsibility on colleges rather than rehabilitation agencies.	10.0 (2)
10.1 Obtain legislative support (funding).						50.0	25.0	16.7	8.3	0 N = 12		
10.2 Establish priorities for current funding which would designate (facilitators) for vocational training (human or material) as a top priority.						33.3	25.0	25.0	16.7	0 N = 12		
10.3 Establish training programs for these helpers.						50.0	33.3	16.7	0	0 N = 12		
11.0 Lack of initial and ongoing mobility orientation	5.1	23.7	52.5	18.6	1						11.0 (3)	11.0 (2)
11.1 Should be stressed by the agency involved and put in budget by the community college administration.						50.0	0	50.0	0	0 N = 12		
12.0 Lack of skilled interpreters for the deaf in all classes including vocational technical classes	19.6	45.4	25.0	8.9	4						12.0 (10) Need more interpreters with skill of sign language. An extreme and urgent need.	
12.1 Training of student service personnel and funds must be made more available.						41.7	33.3	16.7	8.3	0 N = 12		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER - RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
13.0 Lack of available qualified tutorial and remedial assistance for people who cannot cope with regular group and classroom procedures	17.5	35.1	36.8	10.5	3						13.0 (15) Lack of trained peer helpers and professionals is too often overlooked. Remedial assistance makes the difference, whether handicapped or not. Very severe--tutoring essential for all sensorily handicapped. Need to retrain surplus special educators to work at the college level.	13.0 (2)
13.1 Change attitudes of personnel who fail to realize the need for this assistance.						16.7	16.7	33.3	16.7	16.7 N = 12		
13.2 Provide appropriate training programs for personnel to develop tutorial and remedial assistance.						25.0	50.0	25.0	0	0 N = 12		
13.3 Secure funding for such positions on community college campuses.						33.3	33.3	8.3	25.0	0 N = 12		
14.0 Lack of persons to work with the handicapped to give additional training when needed by private business as it relates to specific job needs	16.1	37.5	39.3	7.1	4						14.0 (13) This is a severe problem which could be solved by having trained curriculum specialists and instructors on the staff to work directly with industry. Cost needs to be absorbed by private business. Should be higher--has a threefold benefit: business gets involved, students are better trained to work in business, and business wants more students.	14.0 (1)
14.1 Business might provide personnel to work with handicapped persons.						8.3	25.0	33.3	25.0	8.3 N = 12		
14.2 Provide training and funds for job placement personnel.						33.3	16.7	33.3	16.7	0 N = 12		
15.0 Lack of knowledge of what students can do resulting in negative attitudes toward the limitations of the handicapped students.	32.2	39.0	27.1	1.7	1						15.0 (7) Speaks to the need for professionals in rehabilitation to be on the campus. Priority should be in teacher training.	15.0 (2)

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGES (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGES					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
15.1 Provide inservice programs to educate teachers and administrators and bring about attitudinal changes (especially in the case of mental handicaps).						33.3	41.7	16.7	0	8.3 N = 12		
15.2 Establish more preservice training in universities concerning resources which are available to handicapped, how to access resources, and how to use these resources.						50.0	41.7	8.3	0	0 N = 12		
16.0 Lack of knowledge and experience on the part of educators that would make them unwilling to hold students to the same standards of performance of non-handicapped students (example: deaf students)	29.3	29.3	34.5	6.9	2						16.0 (10) This is a high priority item which results from ignorance or lack of training and exposure to handicapped people.	16.0 (2)
16.1 Provide inservice sensitivity and awareness to educate persons responsible for the education of the handicapped.						33.3	41.7	16.7	8.3	0 N = 12		
16.2 Establish definitive behavioral objectives and minimum skill levels needed for job entry that must be met in order to complete course.						41.7	25.0	16.7	8.3	8.3 N = 12		
17.0 Inability on the part of the instructors to empathize instead of sympathize	16.9	27.1	45.8	10.2	1						17.0 (9) Only fosters dependency. Although instructors care about handicapped students there is not enough awareness of their needs and feelings.	17.0 (0)
17.1 Provide inservice training for personnel working with the handicapped which include practical applications and activities.						50.0	33.3	16.7	0	0 N = 12		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
17.2 Make information about various handicaps available to instructors.						41.7	50.0	0	0	8.3 N = 12		
18.0 Lack of self-confidence on part of teachers to teach handicapped students	15.5	32.8	41.4	10.3	2						18.0 (13) This is a very severe barrier. This is more of a problem than understanding, acceptance or indifference.	18.0 (1)
18.1 Provide both pre and in-service training for community college faculty						50.0	41.7	8.3	0	0 N = 12		
19.0 Lack of understanding and acceptance and/or indifference toward the special needs of the handicapped on the part of administrators, faculty and staff	29.8	31.6	31.6	7.0	3						19.0 (8) Problem is severe. There is a lack of training and exposure to the handicapped which results in a barrier even when people mean well.	19.0 (5)
19.1 Provide better and more inservice for community college personnel including knowledge and training on techniques of working with the handicapped students.						50.0	33.3	16.7	0	0 N = 12		
20.0 Negative attitudes of administrators and instructors which inhibit participation of handicapped students in college programs.	20.7	27.6	36.2	15.5	2						20.0 (13) Administrators and instructors don't really know the capabilities of the handicapped.	20.0 (2) Should be lower. Most administrators have no attitude (not aware). Few if any, would be negative.
20.1 Design formal courses of study, workshops and in-service training to bring about attitudinal changes (including removal of "fear")						50.0	0	25.0	25.0	0 N = 12		
Attitudes of Non-disabled Students												
21.0 Lack of acceptance and negative attitudes of peers	11.9	25.4	39.0	23.7	1						21.0 (7) More severe than stated. Peers play a larger role than is indicated.	21.0 (5)
21.1 Provide awareness training activities on community college campuses for the student body						33.3	25.0	16.7	16.7	8.3 N = 12		

Table IV - Continued

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
21.2 Develop and conduct in-service training for educators to bring about acceptance of the handicapped which will lead to peer acceptance.						25.0	25.0	25.0	8.3	16.7 N = 12		
22.0 Lack of acceptance of handicapping conditions by the public which results in lack of participation by the handicapped in social and recreational aspects of college life	15.0	26.7	55.0	3.3	0						22.0 (11) Very severe. There is little social interaction and we need public awareness.	22.0 (6) Less severe than indicated; the public is accepting handicapped student's participation in social and recreational activities.
22.1 Generally people fear what they don't understand; more information should be provided to the public regarding handicapping conditions.						33.3	50.0	0	8.3	8.3 N = 12		
22.2 Develop and conduct in-service training for teachers and non-handicapped students.						27.3	54.5	9.1	0	9.1 N = 11		
23.0 Inadequate orientation of non-handicapped students as to how they may better understand and assist handicapped students	18.6	49.2	27.1	5.1	1						23.0 (7) More should be stressed at the individual program level. The deaf student needs an interpreter at the college level.	23.0 (1) Orientation is not needed, integration is, for people to be comfortable with each other.
23.1 Provide awareness training activities on community college campuses for the student body.						33.3	16.7	25.0	16.7	8.3 N = 12		
Preservice and Inservice Education												
24.0 Lack of general knowledge of the handicapped and handicapping conditions	22.0	50.8	27.1	0	1						24.0 (13) Handicapping conditions are complex; there is a need for resource people for staff inservice and consultation. Knowledge breeds understanding and acceptance.	24.0 (1)

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
											RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Responde
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5		
24.1 Most instructors who are asked to work with handicapped students must learn the hard way--trial and error. Teacher training sessions must include working with handicapped in their own particular discipline.						41.7	33.3	25.0	0	0 N = 12		
25.0 Lack of knowledge that manifestation of handicapping condition is often periodic and unpredictable in timing	6.8	39.0	42.4	11.9	1						25.0 (5)	25.0 (1)
25.1 Information regarding the handicapping condition should be provided to the educator at the time the student registers.						50.0	33.3	16.7	0	0 N = 12		
25.2 Instructors should schedule counseling sessions with all students.						25.0	16.7	33.3	8.3	16.7 N = 12		
25.3 Public relations efforts should be conducted						16.7	41.7	41.7	0	0 N = 12		
26.0 Assumption on the part of the non-disabled instructor, counselor, or administrator that just because the disabled student has not indicated there are problems, that "everything is fine--we have no problems"	10.2	37.3	49.2	3.4	1						26.0 (1) Many do not take this into consideration due to lack of knowledge.	26.0 (1)
26.1 Provide basic knowledge about handicapping conditions through inservice programs						33.3	41.7	25.0	0	0 N = 12		
26.2 Replace the traditional lecture and norm-referenced evaluation with individualized instruction.						18.2	9.1	27.3	45.5	0 N = 11		
26.3 Teach the student to communicate their problems.						33.7	25.0	25.0	8.3	0 N = 12		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
27.0 Inadequate staff preparation and orientation toward working with handicapped students in the area of various learning modalities	16.7	55.0	25.0	3.3	0						27.0 (14) Much more training and in-service is needed for staff.	27.0 (1)
27.1 Provide staff with useful skills which can be applied in teaching the handicapped through in-service and preservice training.						33.3	25.0	33.3	0	8.3 N = 12		
27.2 Train the faculty and staff to screen and refer students to specialists.						33.3	16.7	25.0	25.0	0 N = 12		
28.0 Inadequate training and information is provided to teachers regarding psychological aspects, and learning difficulties of specific handicapping conditions	28.3	45.0	23.3	3.3	0						28.0 (9) Very severe--except for initial contact at beginning of the semester there is little ongoing communication between teacher and rehabilitation counselor. Teacher training is the key to better education everywhere.	28.0 (0)
28.1 Preservice and inservice training should include basic knowledge about handicapping conditions and stress that wide variances between and among people with the same handicap exists.						33.3	41.7	16.7	0	8.3 N = 12		
29.0 Lack of orientation to receptive expressive language deficiencies and the need for specialized language instruction.	9.1	40.0	36.4	14.5	5						29.0 (8) Rated too low because this is generally not understood, or this need met.	29.0 (1)
29.1 Develop classes for the learning disabled and deaf.						27.3	27.3	36.4	0	9.1 N = 11		
29.2 Pay instructors to attend special inservices.						18.2	9.1	36.4	18.2	18.2 N = 11		
30.0 Lack of programs to prepare post-secondary instructors to teach the handicapped	28.8	49.2	16.9	5.1	1						30.0 (12) Separate programs are not always necessary, but programs should be integral to pre and in-service training. Don't want to train all college instructors to be special education teachers, but they do need resource information.	30.0 (2)

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
30.1 Inservice, or one or two classes in instructor training programs should be provided						33.3	33.3	25.0	0	8.3 N = 12		
30.2 Secure state mandate for such training						8.3	16.7	25.0	25.0	25.0 N = 12		
30.3 Develop an educational program for vocational teacher trainers and Texas Education Agency post-secondary staff.						33.3	25.0	33.3	0	8.3 N = 12		
31.0 Instructors inadequately trained in techniques to assist the handicapped student to adapt standard procedures to meet his requirements.	26.7	45.0	25.0	3.3	0						31.0 (12) There is a need for specialists in this area to work with instructors to help plan adaptation.	31.0 (1)
31.1 Instructors should be assisted by a resource person (advisor or counselor)						25.0	16.7	50.0	0	8.3 N = 12		
31.2 Provide graduate level seminars and workshops as a part of employment.												
32.0 Lack of knowledge of and sensitivity to handicapping conditions in planning, implementing, and evaluating instruction and vocational learner outcomes	20.3	45.8	25.4	8.5	1						32.0 (12) Many vocational programs base evaluation on typical employment settings and performance and don't consider adaptations which are routinely made for placement of handicapped workers. Should be integral to inservice and preservice training.	32.0 (2)
32.1 Provide inservice training of faculty						33.3	33.3	25.0	0	8.3 N = 12		
32.2 Provide more research in this area						25.0	37.5	37.5	0	0 N = 8		
33.0 Lack of knowledge and training by staff and administration to be informed about the needs of the hearing impaired	16.9	37.3	40.7	5.1	1						33.0 (13) Handicapping aspects of deafness are not really understood.	33.0 (1)
33.1 The needs of the student are generally known, the staff and administration must learn how to meet these needs.						27.3	27.3	27.3	9.1	9.1 N = 11		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60) 1 2 3 4 NR	FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE 1 2 3 4 5	COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
			RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
33.2 A resource person should be provided.		25.0 33.3 25.0 8.3 8.3 N = 12		
34.0 Lack of counseling and teaching skills needed to accommodate the handicapped student's uniqueness	11.9 61.0 20.3 6.8 1		34.0 (12) Counseling can be the most important aspect of helping the handicapped by defining expectation levels. Most instructors are not adequately trained in counseling techniques to accommodate any student's uniqueness--not just the handicapped student.	34.0 (3)
34.1 Provide inservice training		50.0 16.7 16.7 8.3 8.3 N = 12		
34.2 Obtain legislative support to add counselors and staff.		28.6 14.3 28.6 28.6 0 N = 7		
35.0 Inadequate training programs for physicians, physical therapists, occupational therapists, and social workers to develop techniques to encourage handicapped individuals to compensate for their disabilities by entering training programs.	12.7 27.3 43.6 16.4 5		35.0 (2) Very few physicians are up on rehabilitation medicine. They know more about acute disease processes than long term rehabilitative efforts.	35.0 (4)
35.1 Research need for training		27.3 36.4 27.3 0 9.1 N = 11		
35.2 Provide more training with emphasis on helping the disabled attain the highest level of skill possible.		33.3 16.7 41.7 0 8.3 N = 12		
36.0 Lack of exposure to the world of work by instructors themselves who often set a poor example (model)	13.3 23.3 36.7 26.7 0		36.0 (5) For vocational teachers this should be a high priority and the teacher should have experience in the "real" world.	36.0 (6) Most instructors bring successful work experience to the community college.
36.1 Obtain assistance from a consultant		16.7 16.7 25.0 25.0 16.7 N = 12		
36.2 Upgrade local hiring practices.		0 25.0 41.7 25.0 8.3 N = 12		
37.0 Lack of ability on the part of the instructor to adapt curriculum to the needs of handicapped students	15.3 28.8 45.8 10.2 1		37.0 (11) There is also a lack of creativity in this area as a result of closed minds.	37.0 (4) The degree of success if determined by how well curriculum is developed in regard to a person's language experience.

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60) 1 2 3 4 NR	FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE 1 2 3 4 5	COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
			RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
37.1 Provide an assistant to help the instructor		16.7 25.0 33.3 16.7 8.3 N = 12		
37.2 Provide pre-developed material and instructions for modification of curriculum		8.3 33.3 25.0 16.7 16.7 N = 12		
37.3 Incorporate and integrate training in curriculum adaptation into teacher preparation programs.		16.7 25.0 41.7 8.3 8.3 N = 12		
Prevocational training				
38.0 Lack of appropriate basic and remedial programs in language and math	11.9 28.8 30.5 28.8 1		38.0 (7) Without good basic skill foundations success in achieving skills will be negligible.	38.0 (3) Question whether this belongs at the community college level, except perhaps through special programs.
38.1 Develop departmental programs		41.7 16.7 33.3 8.3 0 N = 12		
38.2 Make tutorial support available		41.7 41.7 16.7 0 0 N = 12		
38.3 Stress the importance of placing emphasis on these subjects to the high schools		41.7 33.3 25.0 0 0 N = 12		
39.0 Inadequate prevocational skill training	19.6 37.5 25.0 17.9 4		39.0 (13) This should be top priority. Include work readiness training here and most handicapped do not have sufficient skills to suit employers.	39.0 (3)
39.1 Provide more funds for prevocational skill training		25.0 16.7 33.3 16.7 8.3 N = 12		
39.2 Increase emphasis on public school career education, vocational program development and opportunities for participation by handicapped students.		33.3 33.3 25.0 8.3 0 N = 12		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
Vocational Instructional Programs and Service												
40.0 Lack of funds to establish training programs for hearing impaired students	14.3	37.5	30.4	17.9	4						40.0 (10) Lack of funds limit programs for handicapped.	40.0 (0)
40.1 Obtain more funds for training (federal agencies and non-profit organizations)						16.7	8.3	50.0	16.7	8.3 N = 12		
41.0 Lack of short-term specialized courses to teach limited skills in a specified area	13.8	44.8	27.6	13.8	2						41.0 (9) Mini courses could be designed and implemented.	41.0 (2)
41.1 Could be handled through continuing education programs						50.0	25.0	8.3	8.3	8.3 N = 12		
41.2 Per student cost makes funding difficult; pooling of resources may be the answer.						16.7	33.3	16.7	25.0	8.3 N = 12		
41.3 Determine the needed areas and request appropriation of funds.						25.0	33.3	25.0	8.3	8.3 N = 12		
42.0 Inadequate existing programs for deaf and hearing impaired students	7.3	38.2	38.2	16.4	5						42.0 (11) There is a real question of any existing adequate programs. An easy obstacle to overcome, yet often overlooked.	42.0 (2)
42.1 Request additional funding to implement necessary programs						25.0	25.0	33.3	16.7	0 N = 12		
42.2 Individualized contracted instruction can be provided for this student body						8.3	16.7	41.7	25.0	8.3 N = 12		
43.0 Communication problems in all instructional situations with handicapped students.	12.7	30.9	43.6	12.7	5						43.0 (8) Communication problems are severe between instructors and normal students even. Little progress without communication.	43.0 (1)
43.1 Establish an interdisciplinary team to conduct a program review and make recommendations						25.0	8.3	50.0	8.3	8.3 N = 12		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
44.0 Communication problems in groups where disabled students are working with the non-disabled, such as group lab practicals.	5.3	36.8	40.4	17.5	3						44.0 (6) Orientation and education programs are needed for nondisabled. Public relations programs needed to educate employers as to benefits of employing handicapped persons.	44.0 (2)
44.1 Provide for orientation programs for non-handicapped to acquaint them with problems handicaps have.						8.3	33.3	33.3	16.7	8.3 N = 12		
45.0 Lack of flexibility in the curriculum to allow the student increased instruction in areas of his expertise.	14.0	28.1	40.4	17.5	3						45.0 (10) Without adjustment in curriculum and teaching strategies the doors are closed to skill attainment. Problems with certification of educational requirement through Texas Education Agency.	45.0 (4)
45.1 A resource person and the department responsible need to develop individualized programs for the handicapped.						25.0	25.0	25.0	16.7	8.3 N = 12		
45.2 On-the-job training might be more practical.						16.7	41.7	33.3	0	8.3 N = 12		
45.3 Establish more flexible entry-exit points of skill development.						25.0	50.0	16.7	0	8.3 N = 12		
46.0 Lack of modification of program standards for different handicaps	13.8	29.3	41.4	15.5	2						46.0 (8) Lack of knowledge and lack of creativity in this area.	46.0 (4) Program standards in vocational education are matched to industry standards.
46.1 A resource person and the department responsible need to develop individualized programs for the handicapped.						16.7	33.3	16.7	25.0	8.3 N = 12		
47.0 Lack of behavior modification programs coordinated with both credit and non-credit courses	10.9	20.0	38.2	30.9	5						47.0 (4) This should be developed fully and supported for legislation with funding. There is a great need but whether it is the repsonsibility of the community college is questionable--how about TRC?	47.0 (6)
47.1 Establish an interdisciplinary team to conduct a program review and make recommendations.						25.0	25.0	16.7	25.0	8.3 N = 12		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60) 1 2 3 4 NR	FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE 1 2 3 4 5	COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
			RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
48.0 Lack of ongoing contact with the handicapped student to monitor progress and problems and to offer encouragement and support throughout his educational program.	10.3 31.0 43.1 15.5 2		48.0 (11) The problem is severe. There is a need to have Certified Rehabilitation Counselors and peer counselors assigned to each student for the duration of the college program. There is not enough staff to keep up with large populations of handicapped students.	48.0 (0)
48.1 Provide more counselors		33.3 25.0 25.0 16.7 0 N = 12		
48.2 Establish better coordination between agencies and the staff at the community college		41.7 41.7 16.7 0 0 N = 12		
48.3 Establish top priorities for rehabilitation services to provide ongoing support for handicapped students in the early years of training and job experience.		33.3 25.0 41.7 0 0 N = 12		
48.4 Provide individualized educational planning.		33.3 25.0 25.0 8.3 8.3 N = 12		
49.0 Vocational/technical class entrance exams that do not consider handicapping conditions such as learning disabilities in establishing norms.	10.3 36.2 36.2 17.2 2		49.0 (12) There is inadequate preassessment of handicaps. Adaptation of systems approach to instruction will alleviate this to a major extent.	49.0 (2) Do learning disabilities belong in college? Norms need to be more flexible.
49.1 Remove or modify norms to accommodate the handicapped.		27.3 18.2 9.1 36.4 9.1 N = 11		
50.0 Unwillingness of instructors to give oral examinations when appropriate.	12.1 10.3 48.3 29.3 2		50.0 (6) This attitude sets conditions for a student to fail.	50.0 (6)
50.1 Pay instructors for the service.		25.0 16.7 8.3 33.3 16.7 N = 12		
50.2 Enlist help from student assistance.		33.3 25.0 16.7 8.3 16.7 N = 12		
51.0 Examinations which are sensorily oriented.	10.7 23.2 44.6 21.4 4		51.0 (3)	51.0 (2)
51.1 Provide alternate methods of testing		25.0 41.7 16.7 8.3 8.3 N = 12		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
											RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5		
52.0 Training areas within programs tend to delimit the occupational choices available to students by offering such a narrow range of skill training.	8.8	26.3	43.9	21.1	3						52.0 (6) Lots of individuals get shelved and categorized because it is easier than taking the time to find out what is truly wanted. Limited training programs are available. Still too much stereotyping of disabilities, i.e., all MR's like to do repetitive type jobs.	52.0 (4)
52.1 Broaden the range of skill training.						8.3	33.3	41.7	8.3	8.3		
						% = 12						
52.2 Awareness of alternatives related to the field should be incorporated in career whorkshops.						25.0	16.7	50.0	0	8.3		
						% = 12						
53.0 Lack of special adapted vocabulary lists to help students in various occupational technical programs.	10.5	14.0	45.6	29.8	3						53.0 (3) If a student does not understand the terms there is no way he can learn a skill.	53.0 (3)
53.1 Provide reading programs for specific technical majors.						25.0	25.0	33.3	16.7	0		
						% = 12						
53.2 Necessary materials should be prepared by the faculty/staff concerned.						16.7	33.3	33.3	8.3	8.3		
						% = 12						
54.0 Lack of modified textbooks to meet language level of students.	13.6	22.0	49.2	15.3	1						54.0 (5) Sensorially handicapped and LLD students need supplemental materials and modified texts. Open door policy requires administration and therefore, accommodation.	54.0 (1)
54.1 Provide modified texts (tape, rewrite) or teach with teacher made materials.						25.0	33.3	25.0	8.3	8.3		
						% = 12						
54.2 Consult with the book company.						50.0	0	33.3	16.7	0		
						% = 12						
55.0 Student/trainer ratio too large to allow sufficient individualized hands-on training	22.0	27.1	37.3	13.6	1						55.0 (9) This should be top priority. Many handicapped are embarrassed to ask for additional help especially in a large class.	55.0 (2) The community college has a policy of small classes and this should not be a problem.
55.1 Provide special assistants, aides and/or volunteers.						25.0	16.7	33.3	16.7	8.3		
						% = 12						

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60) 1	2	3	4	NR	FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE 1	2	3	4	5	COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS: RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
55.2 Obtain legislative support to increase funding for more personnel.						33.3	16.7	33.3	16.7	0 N = 12		
6.0 Student/trainer ratio too large to allow appropriate administration of tests.	19.0	20.7	41.4	19.0	2						56.0 (5) If one cannot evaluate skill levels, then how can one determine progress unless curriculum is based on performance objective. Skill level evaluation is essential.	56.0 (3) Testing situations are feasible; individual testing is easily arranged.
56.1 Provide a specialized testing program.						33.3	0	41.7	16.7	8.3 N = 12		
56.2 Provide funds for better student/trainer ratio or special assistants.						16.7	16.7	41.7	16.7	8.3 N = 12		
56.3 Individualize testing procedures.						16.7	41.7	25.0	8.3	8.3 N = 12		
56.4 Hire a paraprofessional						16.7	25.0	16.7	25.0	16.7 N = 12		
7.0 Inadequate task analysis of technical skill areas in relation to training students with handicaps	24.6	24.6	42.1	8.8	3						57.0 (8) This eliminates a great many students who could attend if work place adjustments were available. Should be a top priority.	57.0 (3)
57.1 Fund exemplary programs in area of task analysis						33.3	8.3	33.3	16.7	8.3 N = 12		
57.2 Train staff in methods of scientific job/task analysis in curriculum development						25.0	33.3	16.7	16.7	8.3 N = 12		
8.0 Lack of training programs for handicapped individuals in the emerging technology areas	19.0	25.9	41.4	13.8	2						58.0 (7) Vocational/technical counselors, teachers, advisors, and tutors are still looking at disabilities rather than abilities. There is a need for more places that will hire the handicapped.	58.0 (3)
58.1 Obtain funding to permit organization and implementation of such programs.						33.3	8.3	41.7	8.3	8.3 N = 12		
58.2 For a liaison with business.						33.3	25.0	33.3	0	8.3 N = 12		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
59.0 Limited variety of vocational/technical areas which accept handicapped students.	13.8	31.0	41.4	13.8	2						59.0 (7) Vocational/technical counselors, teachers, advisors, and tutors are still looking at disabilities rather than abilities. There is a need for more places that will hire the handicapped.	59.0 (6)
59.1 Provide pre and inservice education for faculty and administration to bring about attitudinal changes.						16.7	50.0	16.7	8.3	8.3 N = 12		
59.2 Expand electives and subject areas.						33.3	25.0	33.3	0	8.3 N = 12		
59.3 Identify "model" programs which community college administration and faculty can visit as an example.						41.7	33.3	8.3	8.3	8.3 N = 12		
60.0 A lack of specific entry level job criteria that a person with limited ability could accomplish and achieve in order to be employable.	21.4	33.9	33.9	10.7	4						60.0 (7) This is a very severe problem--coordination is needed between training programs and industry to determine minimum job entry level skills needed to be hired and then to train those with limited ability to fill this need.	60.0 (4)
60.1 Work closely with business to establish jobs that handicapped persons may do.						50.0	33.3	8.3	8.3	0 N = 12		
60.2 Bring in consultants for technical assistance.						50.0	8.3	16.7	16.7	8.3 N = 12		
60.3 Develop a career ladder self-paced program.						41.7	8.3	25.0	16.7	8.3 N = 12		
61.0 Absence of a continuum of training skills for elementary through secondary education through vocational technical programs.	19.3	35.1	35.1	10.5	3						61.0 (8) The continuum of education training from elementary through post-secondary is fragmented at best.	61.0 (1)
61.1 Establish a sequential curriculum.						25.0	50.0	0	16.7	8.3 N = 12		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
61.2 Obtain legislative support to increase funding for more personnel and broader range of training opportunities at all levels.						16.7	8.3	41.7	25.0	8.3 N = 12		
62.0 Lack of exit points in the curriculum which allow the student to leave (with recognition) when the student has achieved to the highest level of his ability or employability.	8.6	29.3	43.1	19.0	2						62.0 (11) There is a need for more flexibility for entry and exit for students in vocational programs.	62.0 (3) This problem is being taken care of through flexible entry programs.
62.1 Establish new policies at The Texas Education Agency level.						33.3	25.0	16.7	16.7	8.3 N = 12		
62.2 Establish such point for all students and stop counting "completers" on reporting as seven year certificate or two year degree.						50.0	8.3	8.3	25.0	8.3 N = 12		
63.0 Lack of instructional materials and modifications to meet the needs of handicapped students.	22.8	40.4	28.1	8.8	3						63.0 (9) Much is available if it could be identified by and used by instructors--again, there is a need for training instructors. There is very little research and strategies available for instructors to meet handicapped students' needs.	63.0 (2)
63.1 Provide training for faculty to make necessary modifications in materials						33.3	16.7	25.0	16.7	8.3 N = 12		
63.2 Prepare and make available materials which will enable a student to learn either by seeing or hearing.						16.7	33.3	33.3	0	16.7 N = 12		
64.0 Lack of knowledge regarding adapting the classroom to the handicapped student, or the handicapped student to the classroom.	11.9	42.4	37.3	8.5	1							
64.1 Obtain a consultant to assist with adaptation.						27.3	27.3	18.2	18.2	9.1 N = 12		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
64.2 Teach handicapped students to communicate their needs.						41.7	33.3	25.0	0	0		
						N = 11						
64.3 Provide inservice training.						25.0	33.3	33.3	0	8.3		
						N = 12						
64.4 Purchase limited adaptable equipment with financial aid available.						16.7	33.3	33.3	8.3	8.3		
						N = 12						
65.0 Lack of reasonable modification of general community college schedules, requirements and procedures.	3.4	20.7	65.5	10.3	2						65.0 (1) An easy obstacle to overcome, yet often overlooked--such functional problems could discourage students from even beginning.	65.0 (3)
65.1 Place a person in each community college who will promote more and better adapted programs for the disabled.						25.0	8.3	41.7	16.7	8.3		
						N = 12						
65.2 Establish an open entry/open exit program.						25.0	41 7	25.0	0	8.3		
						N = 12						
66.0 Lack of reasonable modification of classroom and laboratory.	10.2	25.4	50.8	13.6	1						66.0 (5) Example: typing tables wheelchairs can fit under. Necessary for proper accessibility.	66.0 (3)
66.1 Place a person in each community college who will promote more and better adapted programs for the disabled.						27.3	9.1	45.5	9.1	9.1		
						N = 11						
66.2 Involve vocational classes in construction of specialized equipment.						25 0	25.0	33.3	8.3	8.3		
						N = 12						
BARRIERS WITHIN THE HELPING SYSTEM												
Vocational Materials and Equipment												
67.0 Lack of adaptable equipment that will facilitate teaching the handicapped.	26.3	42.1	24.6	7.0	3						67.0 (5) Needs to be give a higher priority. Very severe with drafting students at present.	67.0 (3)
67.1 Establish a pool of adaptable equipment available to various teachers on request.						36.4	54.5	9.1	0	0		
						N = 11						
67.2 Secure funding for necessary additional equipment.						10.0	60.0	30.0	0	0		
						N = 10						

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
68.0 Lack of electronic communication devices to assist the handicapped in understanding, participating and communicating.	14.3	19.6	57.1	8.9	4						68.0 (2) There are a great number of devices available that have not been tapped due to lack of awareness.	68.0 (3)
68.1 Obtain funds, and promote research and development.						18.2	54.5	18.2	9.1	0 N = 11		
69.0 Lack of modified and adaptive equipment for drafting students.	10.9	25.5	50.9	12.7	5						69.0 (6) Funds are needed for adaptive equipment.	69.0 (3)
69.1 Obtain funds (excess cost funding), promote research and development.						30.0	50.0	10.0	10.0	0 N = 10		
70.0 Lack of special equipment such as special seating, materials, sound lighting, adaptation for wheelchairs.	15.5	37.9	36.2	10.3	2						70.0 (8) Additional funding is needed. For the most part equipment is available but money is not.	70.0 (2)
70.1 Obtain funds (excess cost funding), promote research and development.						27.3	27.3	36.4	9.1	0 N = 11		
70.2 Involve the community and vocational classes in construction or acquisition of equipment.						54.5	27.3	18.2	0	0 N = 11		
71.0 Lack of funds to provide for special expenses such as special equipment.	29.8	42.1	22.8	5.3	3						71.0 (11) Lack of funds must be the most significant of all problems. Lack of knowledge about funding is a problem for most.	71.0 (2)
71.1 Obtain funds (excess cost funding), promote research and development.						10.0	60.0	20.0	10.0	0 N = 10		
71.2 Initiate special adaptive devices with the individual rather than the institution.						30.0	30.0	30.0	0	10.0 N = 10		
71.3 Obtain more legislative support.						55.6	11.1	22.2	0	11.1 N = 9		
72.0 Difficulty in using independent learning center where cassette-tapes and slides are used for self-paced learning.	10.3	31.0	50.0	8.6	2						72.0 (6) This is a problem especially for the deaf. Lack of properly designed material for deaf students.	72.0 (4) Where such centers exist, there is much help available.
72.1 Hire work-study students to assist						40.0	30.0	20.0	10.0	0 N = 10		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
72.2 Provide alternate learning activities.						50.0	50.0	0	0	0 N = 12		
73.0 Problems in working with dangerous power equipment, handling of heavy or difficult objects, and coping with difficult working conditions (i.e., wet floors) in vocational technical laboratories	19.6	16.1	46.4	17.9	4						73.0 (6)	73.0 (2) This whole area--"it's too hard or dangerous for the handicapped"--is exaggerated. Unaware instructors and counselors can block an individual from participating and gaining skill for employment with education on adapting safety devices, the participation may be feasible.
73.1 Provide orientation for instructors						66.7	11.1	22.2	0	0 N = 9		
73.2 Change the program of the handicapped student who is obviously unsuited for the course.						55.6	33.3	11.1	0	0 N = 9		
74.0 Inappropriate design of classrooms, laboratories and equipment.	14.0	29.8	42.1	14.0	3						74.0 (8) Labs were not designed for the handicapped--especially wheelchairs	74.0 (2)
74.1 Secure funding for necessary additional equipment.						8.3	25.0	58.3	8.3	0 N = 12		
74.2 Make necessary adaptations.						33.3	50.0	16.7	0	0 N = 12		
75.0 Lack of specially designed tools, and equipment for handicapped students.	17.9	37.5	35.7	8.9	4						75.0 (10) There should be some manufacturing group that could be contracted with to design equipment on an individual basis. Need for a central resource center to check out equipment.	75.0 (1)
75.1 Research should be promoted in the area of specially designed tools and equipment.						40.0	30.0	10.0	20.0	0 N = 10		
75.2 Develop a system for vocational resources similar to the Texas Learning Resource Center (TEA) network to locate resources.						54.5	36.4	9.1	0	0		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
76.0 Inadequate special lighting or magnifying and mechanical devices.	7.3	34.5	47.3	10.9	5						76.0 (6) Needed by visually impaired students to assist in education.	76.0 (4)
76.1 Obtain funds (excess cost funding), promote research and development.						10.0	80.0	0	10.0	0 N = 10		
77.0 Inadequately designed learning and work stations to accommodate the handicapped in vocational training courses.	10.9	38.2	38.2	12.7	5						77.0 (6) Physical barriers pose huge problems. There is a need for good models to adapt to existing facilities.	77.0 (3)
77.1 Obtain funding, promote research and development.						9.1	54.5	18.2	18.2	0 N = 11		
78.0 Lack of typing facilities available to students	12.1	12.1	51.7	24.1	2						78.0 (4) Some students just can't write. Typing could be a means of support if the person had the experience.	78.0 (3)
78.1 Provide a learning center.						61.5	23.1	15.4	0	0 N = 13		
78.2 Obtain funding.						25.0	16.7	50.0	8.3	0 N = 12		
79.0 Inadequate provision of instructional materials and equipment in appropriate media (i.e., special textbooks, tapes and other materials designed for use by the handicapped).	12.5	48.2	33.9	5.4	4						79.0 (7)	79.0 (1)
79.1 Obtain funding, promote research and development.						27.3	18.2	45.5	9.1	0 N = 11		
79.2 Develop a system for vocational resources similar to the Texas Learning Resource Center (TEA) network to locate resources.						54.5	36.4	9.1	0	0 N = 11		
80.0 Lack of tactile maps, braille, optacons, enlargers, and talking books.	16.7	40.7	29.6	13.0	6						80.0 (7) These should be mandatory purchases since this represents eyesight.	80.0 (0)
80.1 Obtain these through resources which make them available.						80.0	20.0	0	0	0 N = 10		
81.0 Lack of special lighting for interpreters to use who work with deaf students during films.	9.4	26.4	45.3	18.9	7						81.0 (2) One piece of equipment can change this.	81.0 (4)

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATED BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATED BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
											RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5		
81.1 Obtain funding (excess cost funding).						30.0	50.0	10.0	10.0	0 N = 10		
Research												
82.0 An unwillingness on the part of the academic community at the Administrative and Board level to aggressively research the needs of the handicapped in their district--low budget priority.	32.1	33.9	28.6	5.4	4						82.0 (8) Most administrative units are responding slowly. Local pressure is needed. Bring in advocacy and protective services (state bar, developmental disabilities) to tell board about 94-142, 504 and rights of the handicapped.	82.0 (3)
82.1 Apply for grants to colleges to fund research and need identification of disabled students.						25.0	41.7	16.7	8.3	8.3 N = 12		
82.2 Provide funded graduate level seminars and workshops with graduate credit to be conducted during working hours.						36.4	36.4	9.1	0	18.2 N = 11		
82.3 Conduct a needs assessment and present to the governing board.						58.3	25.0	8.3	8.3	0 N = 12		
83.0 Lack of research in area of employer needs.	19.3	45.6	24.6	10.5	3						83.0 (13) Local job market study badly needed. Must know employer needs to design appropriate programs. Need for program specialist between industry and training program.	83.0 (0)
83.1 Apply to local civic groups for funding.						60.0	0	20.0	10.0	10.0 N = 10		
83.2 Determine employment needs so training can be directed towards these areas.						50.0	33.3	8.3	8.3	0 N = 12		
83.3 Assign this responsibility to the Texas Rehabilitation Commission.						18.2	36.4	36.4	9.1	0 N = 11		
84.0 Inadequate learning technology: lack of learning aides and technology to accommodate specific impairments.	16.4	34.5	40.0	9.1	5						84.0 (6) Slavish addiction to the lecture form, even in technical/vocational areas which bars the use of new and needed technology. Need additional research	84.0 (5)
84.1 Provide funds for adquate research						14.3	42.9	28.6	14.3	0 N = 7		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
84.2 Apply current research and technology (technology not lacking)						77.8	22.0	0	0	0		
						N = 9						
Counseling, placement and followup												
85.0 Lack of realistic counseling and goal setting	22.4	46.6	25.9	5.2	2						85.0 (7) There are too few trained counselors on campus. Adoption of career education model would help.	85.0 (2)
85.1 Provide training for counselors.						76.9	7.7	15.4	0	0		
						N = 13						
85.2 Secure specially trained counselors.						53.8	30.8	15.4	0	0		
						N = 13						
86.0 Lack of diagnostic, counselling, and health centers on the community college campus	13.8	37.9	36.2	12.1	2						86.0 (9) Need more funds and better trained counselors. Very expensive but very beneficial to the handicapped.	86.0 (2)
86.1 Employ and/or train appropriate personnel and monitor to see that services are provided.						53.8	7.7	23.1	7.7	7.7		
						N = 13						
86.2 Make administration aware of the laws.						69.2	7.7	23.1	0	0		
						N = 13						
87.0 Inadequate prevocational exploration background information, and exposure to the world of work.	29.8	38.6	26.3	5.3	3						87.0 (10) This should be a top priority area. More coordination is needed at all levels. Better state guidelines.	87.0 (3)
87.1 Provide adequate prevocational exploration, background information and exposure to the world of work at the high school level.						83.3	8.3	8.3	0	0		
						N = 12						
87.2 Provide for student vocational evaluation and counseling.						66.7	25.0	8.3	0	0		
						N = 12						
87.3 Provide more preservice training in universities regarding resources available to the handicapped.						72.7	18.2	9.1	0	0		
						N = 11						
88.0 Lack of adequate evaluation and diagnosis before making career decisions.	23.2	42.9	28.6	5.4	4						88.0 (11) Very few resources of this nature are available on the community college campus. Career decisions still a shot in the dark--although improving.	88.0 (2)

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
											RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5		
88.1 Facilitate exchange of information among agencies and community colleges.						72.7	18.2	9.1	0	0		
						N = 11						
88.2 Provide counseling.						63.6	36.4	0	0	0		
						N = 11						
89.0 Inadequate counseling and guidance services to help handicapped students cope with the educational environment.	12.3	43.9	35.1	8.8	3						89.0 (10) Services of qualified counselors for the handicapped are lacking--too many politics are interfering and preventing hiring of personnel	89.0 (2)
89.1 Provide training for counselors and secure specially trained counselors.						66.7	16.7	16.7	0	0		
						N = 12						
89.2 Increase number of counselors.						33.3	25.0	33.3	8.3	0		
						N = 12						
90.0 Inadequate definition of job entry level skills needed by the client to perform in selected careers	19.0	25.9	46.6	8.6	2						90.0 (11) Scientific job analysis is crucial to all technical vocational programs. Need for program specialists. Too few trained, knowledgeable counselors.	90.0 (3)
91.0 Inadequate training in job seeking and interviewing skills	17.2	41.4	37.9	3.4	2						91.0 (10) Again points to the need for providing trained and knowledgeable counselors.	91.0 (2)
91.1 Establish top priorities for rehabilitation services to provide ongoing support for handicapped students in early years of training and job experience.						58.3	25.0	16.7	0	0		
						N = 12						
92.0 Inappropriate placement of students in vocational areas to provide instructors with required number of students.	10.3	17.2	41.4	31.0	2						92.0 (5) This does happen. Students are not given enough choice in areas of interest and are channeled into existing areas.	92.0 (4)
92.1 Be more concerned about quality of training rather than numbers.						83.3	8.3	8.3	0	0		
						N = 12						
93.0 Lack of trained counselors on campus to work with disabled students	17.2	44.8	29.3	8.6	2						93.0 (11) Without trained counselors colleges cannot serve the needs of the handicapped adequately. Need more funds.	93.0 (2)
93.1 Provide training for counselors and secure specially trained counselors						58.3	25.0	16.7	0	0		
						N = 12						

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
											RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5		
93.2 Encourage handicapped students to use counseling services.						83.3	16.7	0	0	0		
						N = 12						
94.0 Lack of individual counseling sessions for handicapped students	14.0	29.8	40.4	15.8	3						94.0 (7) Too often individual counseling occurs too late--it should be ongoing.	94.0 (4) A handicapped person can always get counseling if they want it.
94.1 Provide regularly scheduled counseling sessions for handicapped students						54.5	27.3	9.1	0	9.1		
						N = 11						
94.2 Provide workshops to assist counselors.						60.0	10.0	20.0	10.0	0		
						N = 10						
95.0 Lack of adequate career and vocational information and job forecasts with respect to disabilities.	23.2	35.7	32.1	8.9	4						95.0 (9) Need more counselors for the handicapped	95.0 (2)
95.1 Develop a better system of dissemination of vocational and career information with job forecasts.						63.6	18.2	18.2	0	0		
						N = 11						
95.2 Develop a direction system for vocational resources similar to the Texas Learning Resource Center (TEA) network to locate all available resources.						45.5	45.5	9.1	0	0		
						N = 11						
95.3 Develop research in this area.						30.0	30.0	30.0	10.0	0		
						N = 10						
96.0 Inability of the counselor to communicate with deaf students.	26.3	28.1	29.8	15.8	3						96.0 (8) Deaf students' needs are just as important as any other students' needs. Need more qualified counselors.	96.0 (3)
96.1 Employ or train counselors who can communicate with deaf students						36.4	27.3	27.3	9.1	0		
						N = 11						
97.0 Inadequate support systems such as therapy groups to encourage attendance in school	15.5	27.6	41.4	15.5	2						97.0 (7) There is a need for ongoing therapy.	97.0 (4)
97.1 Train counselors to provide these services						36.4	36.4	0	18.2	9.1		
						N = 11						
97.2 Provide a larger counseling staff.						18.2	36.4	9.1	27.3	9.1		
						N = 11						

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATED BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATED BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
98.0 Inadequate communication with instructor regarding varying degrees of handicapping conditions and the limitations involved.	15.3	37.3	42.4	5.1	1						98.0 (2)	98.0 (3)
98.1 Train counselors to communicate with instructors regarding handicapping conditions						61.5	15.4	15.4	7.7	0 N = 13		
98.2 Make a resource person, or consultant responsible.						76.2	31.8	15.4	7.7	0 N = 13		
99.0 Inadequate preparation for the psychological and physical demands of being a "worker"	20.7	36.2	31.0	12.1	2						99.0 (10) Many handicapped persons have been sheltered and must be so prepared.	99.0 (2)
99.1 Provide inservice training for counselors to prepare student to meet demands of being a "worker"						50.0	16.2	33.3	8.2	0 N = 12		
99.2 Provide regularly scheduled counseling sessions during the vocational training.						58.3	25.0	8.3	8.3	0 N = 12		
99.3 Increase emphasis on public school career education and vocational program development and opportunities for participation by handicapped students						50.0	33.3	16.7	0	0 N = 12		
100.0 Vocational or occupational objectives are often selected without adequate awareness of the impact of the disability on the job.	22.4	34.5	34.5	8.6	2						100.0 (6) This is true in highly industrial areas. Vocational assessment is needed along with hands-on experiences. Need for careful planning with trained counselors.	100.0 (2)
100.1 Experienced counseling with a realistic approach should assist students in selecting vocational objectives						33.3	58.3	8.3	0	0 N = 12		
101.0 Inadequate diagnostic and individual planning for adults with learning disabilities	1x	25	36		3						101.0 (7) A large part of the population could have a learning disfunction. Very little of this can be done by staff on campus	101.0

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 50)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS RECORDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
101.1 Research and development of diagnostics for adults with learning disabilities should be conducted.						25.0	25.0	33.3	8.3	8.3 N = 12		
101.2 Assist in skill development techniques.						33.3	33.3	33.3	0	0 N = 12		
102.0 Inadequate training for handicapped persons in developing life long planning skills	19.3	28.1	49.1	3.5	3						102.0 (3) Institutions are lacking in this area for the total population, not just the handicapped.	102.0 (3)
103.0 Lack of contact with the home to keep the family aware of the student's adjustment and progress.	7.0	21.1	56.1	15.8	3						103.0 (2)	103.0 (6) Contact with home is not needed.
103.1 Place renewed emphasis on this barrier						33.3	8.3	41.7	16.7	0 N = 12		
104.0 Lack of support services of counseling, advising and self-help groups to provide coping and adaptive skills for school environment and work environments.	10.3	34.5	46.6	8.6	2						104.0 (7) Without these services it will be extremely difficult to achieve one's goal if one is severely disabled.	104.0 (3)
104.1 Create handicapped "clubs" for students where they can exchange ideas about coping						50.0	25.0	25.0	0	0 N = 12		
104.2 Provide workshops to help counselors with this						41.7	33.3	25.0	0	0 N = 12		
105.0 Lack of recruitment of other handicapped students by successful handicapped students	10.3	22.4	44.8	22.4	2						105.0 (2) More emphasis should be placed on this type of recruitment.	105.0 (5)
105.1 Provide funds to develop such counseling services.						16.7	16.7	50.0	0	16.7 N = 12		
106.0 Counseling needed to direct students to appropriate programs, to explore qualifications for programs, to determine costs and scholarships available.	10.7	30.4	48.2	10.7	4						106.0 (6) This will eliminate alot of headaches if the student is counseled properly.	106.0 (2)

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
106.1 Provide funds to develop such counseling services.						36.4	9.1	36.4	9.1	9.1 N = 11		
106.2 Develop a system for vocational resources similar to the Texas Learning Resource Center (TEA) to locate all available resources						54.5	9.1	36.4	0	0 N = 11		
Student Accounting System												
107.0 Lack of an adequate system of reporting students to Coordinating Board and TEA; current system does not identify handicapped students and in turn does not provide additional funds for provisions of special services.	26.8	26.8	32.1	14.3	4						107.0 (8) A system of reporting could be an effective tool in enhancing enrollment.	107.0 (2) Strongly disagree with approach. High schools should work with appropriate agencies (Texas Rehabilitation Commission, Texas Commission for the Blind, Texas Commission for the Deaf, etc.) to access resources available. No system exists (although one is proposed) to identify handicapped students in a mainstreamed setting.
107.1 Develop a method of accounting for students.						45.5	45.5	9.1	0	0 N = 11		
Lack of Financial Resources												
108.0 Lack of financial resources to pay living expenses, tuition, books, etc., and for expenses relating to the handicap itself.	25.5	34.5	32.7	7.3	5						108.0 (5) More staff need to get involved in this. Not enough is known about how to access agencies.	108.0 [illegible]
108.1 The Texas Rehabilitation Agency, Commission for the Blind and other state agencies need to be more liberal of acceptance of clients.						18.2	36.4	36.4	0	9.1 N = 11		
108.2 More legislative support is needed.						54.5	18.2	18.2	0	9.1 N = 11		
108.3 Make the need known to various organizations who might provide scholarships or needed grants.						27.3	36.4	27.3	9.1	0 N = 11		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
BARRIERS WITHIN SOCIETY												
Lack of Knowledge About The Helping System												
109.0 Lack of coordination and identification of community referral agencies.	13.2	38.2	40.0	3.6	5						109.0 (9) Better coordination would permit better programs. There is a need to publicize more.	109.0 (3)
109.1 Publish a directory for the area served by each community college						41.7	41.7	16.7	0	0		
						N = 12						
109.2 Designate a particular on-campus counselor to have information available						58.3	33.3	8.3	0	0		
						N = 12						
110.0 Lack of awareness of improvements available through rehabilitation engineering by handicapped persons, their families, professors and rehabilitation personnel	9.1	30.9	52.7	7.3	5						110.0 (6) Severe because a barrier could be eliminated with such knowleuge. Disagree with wording: should be a lack of services provided by TRC to work with all areas of handicapping conditions, also a lack of a human resource agency with knowledge of needs of families of the handicapped.	110.0 (2)
110.1 Distribution of publications by reserach and development agencies to consumers and consumer agencies.						33.3	50.0	16.7	0	0		
						N = 12						
111.0 Lack of coordination of services between the institution and the providers of social services to focus common resources on needs of the handicapped.	20.0	32.7	38.2	9.1	5						111.0 (8) Coordination should be a top priority.	111.0 (3)
111.1 Establish interagency committees.						20.0	50.0	30.0	0	0		
						N = 10						
111.2 Designate a liaison person and complement with community research component.						50.0	20.0	30.0	0	0		
						N = 10						
112.0 Lack of information available regarding the resources to assist the handicapped, i.e., transportation, medical, personal care, etc.	17.0	41.5	37.7	3.8	7						112.0 (6)	112.0 (1)

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
112.1 Establish interagency committees.						40.0	30.0	30.0	0	0		
						N = 10						
112.2 Provide transportation assistance.						18.2	36.4	45.5	0	0		
						N = 11						
Attitudinal Barriers												
113.0 Attitudinal barriers which would not allow a well trained student to function in industry	16.7	35.2	38.9	9.3	6						113.0 (9) Attitudinal barriers would definitely keep an individual from getting a job.	113.0 (3) Attitudinal barriers cannot be removed by a community college.
113.1 Establish an effective public awareness campaign.						63.6	27.3	9.1	0	0		
						N = 11						
114.0 Patronizing attitude on the part of society.	16.7	37.5	33.9	12.5	4						114.0 (3) Poor attitude towards the handicapped. There is a need for awareness and public education.	114.0 (3)
114.1 Provide more public relations information.						69.2	15.4	7.7	0	7.7		
						N = 13						
114.2 Provide preservice training in universities to change attitudes of educators.						61.5	15.4	23.1	0	0		
						N = 13						
115.0 Exclusion of handicapped students by non-handicapped individuals	10.5	22.8	49.1	17.5	3						115.0 (5) While no one would like to admit to this, it is probably more prevalent than we believe. Should be rated at least 2.00.	115.0 (4)
115.1 Provide more public information.						61.5	23.1	0	15.4	0		
						N = 13						
116.0 Indifference within society	12.5	32.1	48.2	7.1	4						116.0 (7) Changes do not occur unless awareness is experienced.	116.0 (4)
116.1 Provide more public information.						69.2	15.4	0	15.4	0		
						N = 13						
117.0 Employers or parents who would not allow handicapped students completing child development or child care courses to be responsible for children.	17.0	28.3	41.5	13.2	7						117.0 (3)	117.0 (1)
117.1 Provide a well-timed effective public awareness campaign at federal, state, and local levels						60.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	0		
						N = 10						

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
118.0 Negative attitudes toward the handicapped (includes parents of handicapped, teachers or professors, employers, and fellow workers)	10.5	42.1	38.6	8.8	3						118.0 (3)	118.0 (2)
118.1 Provide systematic education of the public through media						50.0	33.3	8.3	8.3	0 N = 12		
119.0 Inadequate expectations (dependency rather than independency is reinforced by society)	12.5	39.3	39.3	8.9	4						119.0 (10) There is a need for appropriate methods to foster independency without rejection.	119.0 (1) My experience has been that there is a high degree of unrealistic expectations--both too much or too little.
119.1 Provide for in preservice education and experience.						41.7	16.7	41.7	0	0 N = 12		
Inadequate Leadership												
120.0 Community served by Community College may not realize the need to serve adult handicapped, i.e., little or no pressure on the college to provide services.	19.0	31.0	41.4	8.6	2						120.0 (4) Without community expression of strong interest changes are difficult to achieve.	120.0 (2)
120.1 Utilize mass media to make community aware of the need for programs, create concern and interest in their well-being (such as Child Find)						66.7	25.0	8.3	0	0 N = 12		
Media Barriers												
121.0 Lack of public education on handicapping conditions	35.1	28.1	28.1	8.8	3						121.0 (10) More public education is needed here.	121.0 (2)
121.1 Provide public relations programs and information to the public.						66.7	8.3	25.0	0	0 N = 12		
121.2 Use case studies in public advertising to assist the disabled person, i.e., stories about the director of the Veterans Administration.						50.0	25.0	25.0	0	0 N = 12		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
Transportation												
122.0 Lack of adequate transportation provisions to and from the community college and within it	32.8	27.6	31.0	8.6	2						122.0 (12) There is a big need for more buses, vans, or mini buses, to get to and from the community college. Important for deaf students. There can be nothing without transportation--but service must be excellent for handicapped students.	122.0 (3)
122.1 Secure necessary funds for transportation system.						41.7	33.3	16.7	8.3	0		
						N = 12						
122.2 Involve the community.						33.3	58.3	8.3	0	0		
						N = 12						
122.3 Should be addressed by a coordinated public transportation system which is accessible to the full spectrum of students with handicapping conditions. For each of the facilities mentioned to try to initiate its own transportation is very expensive and not usually cost effective. Helping System should be able to purchase transportation services from the accessible transportation.						66.7	8.3	25.0	0	0		
						N = 12						
123.0 Transportation to job training facility	24.6	28.1	36.8	10.5	3						123.0 (8) If you can't get to work you can't work and individual becomes more dependent on society.	123.0 (1)
123.1 Include transportation in excess costs for mainstreaming.						16.7	41.7	33.3	8.3	0		
						N = 12						
123.2 Conduct a needs assessment.						41.7	25.0	16.7	8.3	0		
						N = 12						
124.0 Transportation to employment.	23.2	32.1	33.9	[illegible]	4						124.0 (9) There is a need for public transportation.	124.0 (1)
124.1 Include transportation in excess costs for mainstreaming. *						11.1	44.4	33.3	11.1	0		
						N = 9						

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
Employment Barriers												
125.0 Unwillingness of employers in private business to provide personnel assistance (advocates) for the handicapped.	14.5	32.7	40.0	12.7	5						125.0 (3) There is little support from industry.	125.0 (4)
125.1 Conduct a sustained campaign of education of potential employers						33.3	41.7	16.7	0	8.3 N = 12		
125.2 Research should provide statistics to indicate that personnel assistance will help business.						33.3	33.3	8.3	16.7	8.3 N = 12		
126.0 Unwillingness of employers in private business to provide financial support for the handicapped.	15.1	28.3	37.7	18.9	7						126.0 (3)	126.0 (5) Employers should not be expected to subsidize any employee.
126.1 Provide tax credits for extra expenses employers encounter in training the handicapped.						30.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	10.0 N = 10		
127.0 Inability to earn money in part time employment while attending school	9.1	23.6	54.5	12.7	5						127.0 (6)	127.0 (3)
127.1 Plan with work study program and set up a job placement for handicapped.						36.4	18.2	45.5	0	0 N = 11		
127.2 Provide part time employment in the school system.						45.5	27.3	27.3	0	0 N = 11		
128.0 Poor prospects of obtaining a job after completion of study.	11.1	38.9	40.7	9.3	6						128.0 (6) Results from little or unrealistic planning, career choice, etc., during initiation of services.	128.0 (2) Companies are trying to fill their quota
128.1 These would be improved by careful selection of training program.						36.4	45.5	18.2	0	0 N = 11		
128.2 Establish top priorities for rehabilitation services to provide ongoing support for handicapped students in early years of training and job experience.						36.4	45.5	18.2	0	0 N = 11		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
129.0 Stereotyping by society, i.e., "You have diabetes thus you're probably going to be a poorer worker", "You'll cause us to have to pay higher insurance", "You can't learn like the others", "I'll have to spend additional time with you".	32.7	32.7	29.1	5.5	5						129.0 (7) Need for public education. Vocational educators do not work with business people and the community to develop realistic expectations.	129.0 (2)
129.1 Provide public education regarding the capabilities of the handicapped.						58.3	16.7	16.7	0	8.3 N = 12		
130.0 Unwillingness of employers to hire the hearing impaired.	19.3	33.3	40.4	7.0	3						130.0 (3)	130.0 (3)
130.1 Provide public education regarding the capabilities of the deaf.						66.7	16.7	8.3	8.3	0 N = 12		
130.2 Change OSHA rules.						8.3	16.7	58.3	16.7	0 N = 12		
131.0 Handicapped are routed into "low salary and low prestige" vocations	22.4	25.9	43.1	8.6	2						131.0 (4)	131.0 (2)
131.1 Provide career information to counselors and students.						46.2	38.5	15.4	0	0 N = 13		
132.0 Employers are unwilling to accept handicapped persons in their employ due to lack of sufficient information regarding handicapping conditions.	30.4	37.5	28.6	3.6	4						132.0 (9) Need for providing workshops to business and industry on these areas.	132.0 (5)
132.1 Conduct a public campaign regarding the abilities of the handicapped.						58.3	25.0	0	16.7	0 N = 12		
132.2 Provide employers information regarding the handicapping conditions						66.7	25.0	8.3	0	0 N = 12		
Architectural Barriers												
133.0 Architectural barriers which would not allow a well trained student to function in industry	28.1	36.8	29.8	5.3	3						133.0 (5) The problem is severe, but industry is changing to meet needs. Pressure and educational activities must be consistent.	133.0 (3)

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
133.1 Work with the City Planning Department as well as individual businesses.						41.7	33.3	25.0	0	0		
						N = 12						
133.2 Enforce current laws.						41.7	33.3	25.0	0	0		
						N = 12						
133.3 Give tax credits to remove barriers.						41.7	8.3	33.3	0	16.7		
						N = 12						
134.0 Buildings are inaccessible because they are not barrier free	24.6	42.1	29.8	3.5	3						134.0 (4) Federal law mandates	134.0 (4)
134.1 Funding should be obtained to assist with this problem						33.3	25.0	41.7	0	0		
						N = 12						
134.2 Enforce current laws.						66.7	25.0	8.3	0	0		
						N = 12						
135.0 Housing designed to accommodate handicapped students.	21.1	43.9	24.6	10.5	3						135.0 (3) Funds are limited by HUD.	135.0 (3)
135.1 Funding should be obtained to assist with this problem.						16.7	33.3	41.7	8.3	0		
						N = 12						
Competing Demands												
136.0 Apprehension about competing with non-handicapped students for grades, job placement, etc., especially when performance is measured by subjective means as well as objective means.	12.7	34.5	43.6	9.1	5						136.0 (1) Human development courses address this problem and should be required by all handicapped students.	136.0 (3)
136.1 Teachers could assist by helping the handicapped to understand that they are competing only with themselves.						41.7	16.7	33.3	8.3	0		
						N = 12						

Table IV - Continued

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60) 1	2	3	4	NR	FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE 1	2	3	4	5	COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS: RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
BARRIERS WITHIN THE HANDICAPPED PERSON, THEIR FAMILIES AND OTHER ADVOCATES												
Handicapped Persons: Physical/ Mental/Emotional Problems												
137.0 Physical conditions which require medication for control of pain resulting in poor attendance	3.6	32.1	50.0	14.3	4						137.0 (1)	137.0 (5)
137.1 Careful planning of the class schedule should be done, so that the student can take advantage of the time when they are not sedated.						37.5	37.5	18.8	0	6.3 N = 16		
137.2 Make instructors aware of this.						62.5	6.3	31.3	0	0 N = 16		
137.3 Develop a home bound program.						37.5	12.5	25.0	18.8	6.3 N = 16		
138.0 Lack of physical dexterity to manipulate mechanical devices	7.0	35.1	45.6	12.3	3						138.0 (4)	138.0 (3) Not a problem if counseled properly.
138.1 Develop assist apparatus.						18.8	18.8	50.0	6.3	6 3 N = 16		
138.2 Place a student in a program where he will not have to cope with the problem.						43.8	18.8	31.3	6.3	0 N = 16		
139.0 Inadequate mobility skills to cope successfully with job related travel	10.5	35.1	45.6	8.8	3						139.0 (1)	139.0 (2)
139.1 Develop assist apparatus.						25.0	25.0	37.5	6.3	6.3 N = 16		
139.2 Provide more and better transit systems						12.5	43.8	37.5	6.3	0 N = 16		
140.0 Inadequate motor skills to perform in vocational technical programs	14.0	31.6	38.6	15.8	3						140.0 (5)	140.0 (1)
140.1 Develop assist apparatus.						18.8	25.0	43.8	12.5	0 N = 16		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
											RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5		
140.2 Select a program or field where he can perform						62.5	18.8	6.3	12.5	0 N = 16		
141.0 Hearing impairments which make some types of employment dangerous for the handicapped individual	10.9	30.9	41.8	16.4	5						141.0 (4)	141.0 (4) This is not a basic problem--the real problem is accepting the hearing impaired into certain technical areas.
141.1 Do not put a hearing impaired person in such an environment.						62.5	18.8	18.8	0	0 N = 16		
142.0 Difficulty in communicating by writing due to a disability.	8.8	38.6	43.9	8.8	3						142.0 (3) Very severe particularly where the handicapping condition is not apparent.	142.0 (3)
142.1 Obtain a support person or a student helper.						43.8	31.3	18.8	6.3	0 N = 16		
142.2 Develop assist apparatus.						25.0	43.8	25.0	6.3	0 N = 16		
142.3 Develop other means of communication if another method is acceptable.						56.3	31.3	12.5	0	0 N = 16		
143.0 Diseases requiring periodic hospitalization interfere with attendance	8.8	35.1	47.4	8.8	3						143.0 (4)	143.0 (2)
143.1 Provide programs of independent instruction						43.8	43.8	12.5	0	0 N = 16		
143.2 Provide good counseling services.						56.3	31.3	6.3	0	6.3 N = 16		
144.0 Lack of physical strength to teach or work with young children	5.4	14.3	51.8	28.6	4						144.0 (2)	144.0 (3)
145.0 Loss of use of dominant arm requires retraining and causes the person to work slowly	3.6	26.8	53.6	16.1	4						145.0 (5)	145.0 (2)
145.1 Schedule training at a slower rate						37.5	25.0	37.5	0	0 N = 16		
146.0 Physical conditions which impede vocational technical education	10.9	32.7	45.5	10.9	5						146.0 (2)	146.0 (2)
146.1 Select a vocation in which the disability has less impact.						40.0	46.7	13.3	0	0 N = 15		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60) 1 2 3 4 NR	FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE 1 2 3 4 5	COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
			RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
147.0 Inadequate communication skills	9.3 31.5 46.3 13.0 6		147.0 (6) There is a need for more interpreters and student assistants	147.0 (3) Easily remedied through special classes.
147.1 Provide developmental courses for students		64.3 21.4 7.1 7.1 0 N = 14		
148.0 Difficulty in listening to verbal presentations and taking notes simultaneously	8.9 37.5 46.4 7.1 4		148.0 (6) There is a need for funds for interpreters, student assistants and tape recorders.	148.0 (3)
148.1 Provide tape recorders to these students.		73.3 26.7 0 0 0 N = 15		
149.0 Communication problems concerned with receptive and expressive abilities	14.3 28.6 44.6 12.5 4		149.0 (6) The student will continue to fail if not recognized and remedied.	149.0 (1)
149.1 Provide special courses for students with these problems.		20.0 26.7 46.7 6.7 0 N = 15		
150.0 Communication difficulties: watching the interpreter, taking notes and observing the blackboard simultaneously	16.1 35.7 37.5 10.7 4		150.0 (6) There is a need to have more support services and better material for the deaf.	150.0 (1)
150.1 Provide special courses for students with these problems.		6.3 18.8 37.5 18.8 18.8 N = 16		
150.2 Educators need to understand that these persons are not in the class for grades, but to learn what they can.		6.3 31.3 18.8 25.0 18.3 N = 16		
150.3 Provide special teachers and small classes		31.3 18.8 31.3 6.3 12.5 N = 16		
151.0 Difficulty in paying attention.	12.5 12.5 53.6 21.4 4		151.0 (5) Mental and emotional states plus effects of constant pain interfere significantly with learning.	151.0 (4)
151.1 Instructor should talk slower and to the point.		6.3 31.3 25.0 18.8 18.8 N = 16		
152.0 Cariovascular conditions which produce insufficient blood supplies to the brain, causing poor memory, poor concentration and blurred vision.	10.7 28.6 37.5 23.2 4		152.0 (1)	152.0 (2)

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
152.1 Try to alleviate these before training begins.						31.3	31.3	31.3	6.3	0 N = 16		
153.0 Physical conditions which require medication for control of pain result in dulled mental faculties.	16.1	23.2	42.9	17.9	4						153.0 (2)	153.0 (2)
153.1 Schedule classes for times of optimum functioning.						25.0	56.3	12.5	0	6.3 N = 16		
153.2 Provide homebound programs and support personnel.						25.0	31.3	43.8	0	0 N = 16		
153.3 Make nurses available on campus.						20.0	33.3	26.7	13.3	6.7 N = 15		
154.0 Inability to accept the discipline and pressure associated with technical programs.	10.9	25.5	49.1	14.5	5						154.0 (6) This is more severe for some disabling conditions.	154.0 (2)
154.1 Provide readily available counseling to ease frustration.						18.8	62.5	6.3	6.3	6.3 N = 16		
155.0 Lack of ability to adhere to stringent time schedules.	12.5	17.9	53.6	16.1	4						155.0 (2)	155.0 (3) Adjustments can be developed to correct this situation.
155.1 Select a type of training which will allow for this.						18.8	50.0	18.8	12.5	0 N = 16		
155.2 Allow for more flexibility in schedules.						12.5	37.5	31.3	12.5	6.3 N = 16		
156.0 Inability to concentrate on the lecture when verbal material is being presented.	10.9	21.8	49.1	18.2	5						156.0 (1)	156.0 (3)
156.1 Provide special coaching on listening techniques.						31.3	43.8	18.8	6.3	0 N = 16		
156.2 Provide support personnel (note takers) tutors						46.7	33.3	13.3	6.7	0 N = 15		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60) 1 2 3 4 NR	FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE 1 2 3 4 5	COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
			RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
157.0 Lack of emotional stability	10.7 30.4 42.9 16.1 4		157.0 (4) May be caused by failure to accept limitations or disability and results in starting many training programs but finishing none. Very common problem among veterans with various disabilities.	157.0 (3)
157.1 Provide regular counseling.		37.5 50.0 12.5 0 0 N = 16		
158.0 Inability to adapt to the discipline of the classroom due to mental illness	12.7 36.4 30.9 20.0 5		158.0 (3) Mental illness doesn't belong in college.	158.0 (4) Human development courses can correct this situation.
158.1 Provide regular counseling.		50.0 18.8 12.5 12.5 6.3 N = 16		
159.0 Slowed responses and poor concentration caused by medication taken for mental illness which often results in insulation from reality.	14.5 34.5 32.7 18.2 5		159.0 (3) Some clients may not be ready for college and shouldn't be there as the problem is severe.	159.0 (4)
159.1 Obtain medical advice		31.3 31.3 25.0 0 12.5 N = 16		
Handicapped persons: Lack of Knowledge				
160.0 Inability to handle post-secondary academics	14.5 27.3 40.0 18.2 5		160.0 (6) Better secondary schooling is needed. Post-secondary academics are not the appropriate channel for the student.	160.0 (4)
160.1 Provide remedial education and/or special tutors.		33.3 46.7 13.3 6.7 0 N = 15		
160.2 Do not provide for social promotion.		53.8 15.4 15.4 0 15.4 N = 13		
161.0 Inadequate development of basic skill level	18.2 40.0 30.9 10.9 5		161.0 (5)	161.0 (3)
161.1 Provide special tutors and/or remedial education.		40.0 40.0 20.0 0 0 N = 15		
161.2 Increase emphasis on public school career education and vocational program development and opportunities for participation by handicapped students.		46.2 46.2 7.7 0 0 N = 13		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
162.0 Inability to cope with complex written material, charts and graphs	11.1	29.6	44.4	14.8	6						162.0 (2)	162.0 (5)
162.1 Conduct a more careful evaluation before selecting the training program.						62.5	37.5	0	0	0		
						N = 16						
162.2 Individualize instruction.						25.0	18.8	50.0	6.3	0		
						N = 16						
163.0 Lack of understanding of technical vocabulary on which concepts are built.	9.3	24.1	50.0	16.7	6						163.0 (7) (For deaf). Usually the deaf have a very limited vocabulary.	163.0 (5)
163.1 Develop reading (subject oriented) classes.						26.7	46.7	20.0	6.7	0		
						N = 15						
163.2 Have faculty/staff prepare necessary materials.						26.7	33.3	33.3	6.7	0		
						N = 15						
164.0 Failure to realistically assess limitations and potentials	17.0	35.8	41.5	5.7	7						164.0 (5) There is a need for more specialized counseling.	164.0 (4)
164.1 Provide more comprehensive counseling						73.3	20.0	6.7	0	0		
						N = 15						
164.2 Provide reality counseling						66.7	33.3	0	0	0		
						N = 15						
164.3 Students should be encouraged to overcome limitations--they have potentials they are not aware of.						33.3	46.7	13.3	6.7	0		
						N = 15						
165.0 A lack of perception and knowledge of everyday surroundings due to living in a sheltered environment.	14.5	41.8	40.0	3.6	5						165.0 (3) There is a need to make use of the adult performance level program (APL).	165.0 (3)
165.1 Provide initial orientation sessions prior to community college enrollment.						87.5	6.3	6.3	0	0		
						N = 16						
165.2 Do not give more assistance than is absolutely required. Force handicapped to work to his/her maximum potential.						25.0	25.0	31.3	12.5	6.3		
						N = 16						

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60) 1 2 3 4 NR	FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE 1 2 3 4 5	COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
			RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
166.0 Inability to transfer learning to application in order to perform in vocational technical programs.	7.4 14.8 57.4 20.4 6		166.0 (2)	166.0 (4)
166.1 Provide for controlled exposure to the "outside world".		31.3 43.8 12.5 12.5 0 N = 16		
167.0 Lack of knowledge of slang terms by deaf students.	11.8 7.8 56.9 23.5 9		167.0 (3)	167.0 (6) Not important.
167.1 Special instruction should be provided that will help student adapt.		38.5 38.5 15.4 7.7 0 N = 13		
168.0 Inadequate knowledge of life skills	10.9 30.9 47.3 10.9 5		168.0 (5) The handicapped (as well as all students) have a need for life long living skills.	168.0 (5)
168.1 Provide counseling services.		50.0 25.0 25.0 0 0 N = 16		
168.2 Involve the student's family.		31.3 37.5 31.3 0 0 N = 16		
169.0 Inability to develop feasible goals	12.7 25.5 56.4 5.5 5		169.0 (3) Many training failures are due to selecting inappropriate objectives.	169.0 (4)
169.1 Provide reality counseling.		50.0 37.5 12.5 0 N = 16		
Handicapped Persons: Behavioral Barriers				
170.0 Poor home or institutional training for students in areas of initiative, tact, and sharing of responsibility.	13.0 42.6 38.9 5.6 6		170.0 (5) The student is not prepared for daily living much less academic demands if he does not have this background.	170.0 (3)
170.1 Provide adequate counseling.		37.5 43.8 12.5 6.3 0 N = 16		
171.0 Inadequate knowledge of social behavior, and appropriate (behavioral) skills to perform on a job	10.9 41.8 38.2 9.1 5		171.0 (5) The student is not prepared for daily living much less academic demands if he does not have this background.	171.0 (4)
171.1 Group counseling and teaching.		56.3 31.3 12.5 0 0 N = 16		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
											RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5		
171.2 Establish top priorities for rehabilitation services to provide ongoing support for handicapped students in early years of training and job experience.						37.5	43.8	18.8	0	0		
						N = 16						
172.0 Inability to adjust towards the life style in a college setting.	5.5	25.5	56.4	12.7	5						172.0 (2) There is a need to ameliorate these problems to admission in regular programs.	172.0 (5)
173.0 Behavior problems due to mental or emotional impairments which disrupt classes and keep the student from learning.	12.7	30.9	38.2	18.2	5						173.0 (3) Student should not be in college until he has acquired skills for daily living, or has been through a counseling program to learn strategies for solving specific problems.	173.0 (3)
173.1 These should be resolved or minimized before training begins.						25.0	43.8	25.0	6.3	0		
						N = 16						
173.2 Provide behavioral therapy.						37.5	43.8	12.5	6.3	0		
						N = 16						
174.0 Inability to manage personal affairs in order to concentrate on learning experience	9.3	29.6	48.1	13.0	6						174.0 (3) Life long living skills are essential.	174.0 (4)
174.1 Provide opportunity to develop skills through counseling.						46.7	33.3	13.3	6.7	0		
						N = 15						
175.0 Lack of internal orientation	16.7	23.3	53.3	6.7	30						175.0 (3) Essential for severely disabled (especially) and needed by total population.	175.0 (4)
Negative Attitudes and Feelings												
176.0 Poor self concept, low frustration level, making the academic environment more difficult than it actually is.	15.1	39.6	43.4	1.9	7						176.0 (4) Severely handicapped need this adjustment factor. Achieving a positive self concept is frequently discussed and seldom accomplished	176.0 (3)
176.1 Develop programmed short term goals and positive feedback.						56.3	25.0	18.8	0	0		
						N = 16						
176.2 Establish needed support systems for handicapped students in all settings.						31.3	50.0	12.5	0	6.3		
						N = 14						

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60) 1 2 3 4 NR	FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE 1 2 3 4 5	COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
			RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
176.3 Provide more one on one counseling and instruction.		50.0 21.4 14.3 7.1 7.1 N = 14		
177.0 Poor self image leading to the belief that with a disability the client/student cannot compete with others or get a job even if he finishes training.	20.4 42.6 35.2 1.9 6		177.0 (5)	177.0 (3)
177.1 Provide special counseling/assistance.		50.0 35.7 14.3 0 0 N = 14		
177.2 Have students come back to school and talk to the disability student, let them tell others what to expect.		37.5 43.8 12.5 6.3 0 N = 16		
178.0 Poor self concept in the area of interpersonal relations	11.1 42.6 44.4 1.9 6		178.0 (4)	178.0 (3)
178.1 Provide group counseling		60.0 26.7 13.3 0 0 N = 15		
178.2 Provide opportunities for social interaction		53.3 26.7 20.0 0 0 N = 15		
178.3 Establish needed support systems for handicapped students in all settings.		40.0 26.7 20.0 6.7 6.7 N = 15		
179.0 Overly independent attitude, i.e., the student refuses all help and aids.	7.4 11.1 59.3 22.2 6		179.0 (1)	179.0 (4)
179.1 Provide therapy for the student.		21.4 42.9 28.6 0 7.1 N = 14		
180.0 The use of a disability as an excuse for failure or demand for special treatment "the world owes me a living" attitude	13.0 27.8 44.4 14.8 6		180.0 (5) Especially common among Vietnam veterans. Student needs to be in control of self and feelings.	180.0 (3)
180.1 Provide long-term therapy.		31.3 31.3 12.5 6.3 18.8 N = 16		
180.2 Do not give more assistance than is required; force the student to work to his/her maximum potential.		20.0 46.7 13.3 13.3 6.7 N = 15		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5	RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
181.0 Personal feelings of inadequacy and lack of self worth	13.2	39.6	41.5	5.7	7						181.0 (5)	181.0 (3)
181.1 Provide counseling in groups						46.7	53.3	0	0	0		
						N = 15						
181.2 Provide programmed learning experiences						28.6	35.7	21.4	14.3	0		
						N = 14						
181.3 Establish needed support systems for handicapped students in all settings.						26.7	60.0	6.7	0	6.7		
						N = 15						
182.0 Belief that one is being discriminated against due to the handicap	5.6	33.3	51.9	9.3	6						182.0 (3)	182.0 (4)
182.1 Provide counseling						40.0	53.3	6.7	0	0		
						N = 15						
183.0 Lack of aggression in demanding appropriate instruction	11.1	31.5	38.9	18.5	6						183.0 (5)	183.0 (3)
183.1 Provide group counseling						33.3	60.0	6.7	0	0		
						N = 15						
184.0 Anxiety caused by a limited educational background in persons who have not attended school for many years	15.1	28.3	49.1	7.5	7						184.0 (8) This is especially true for retired military.	184.0 (2)
184.1 Begin training at a slow rate to insure success and provide psychological support.						53.3	26.7	13.3	6.7	0		
						N = 15						
185.0 Fear that a handicap will be detrimental in employment which requires short term contact with the public (example: sales) versus a long term sustained relationship with fewer people	9.6	19.2	51.9	19.2	8						185.0 (3)	185.0 (3) Personal barriers must be removed by the individual, not society. Very individual--some handicapped individuals like public contact.
186.0 Lack of self esteem and a positive "can do/will do" attitude	18.5	31.5	42.6	7.4	6						186.0 (8)	186.0 (3)
186.1 Provide special counseling and assistance						50.0	35.7	7.1	7.1	0		
						N = 14						
187.0 Lack of self assurance and assertiveness	25.5	25.5	45.5	3.6	5						187.0 (8) Need the knowledge they are not competing with anyone else.	187.0 (3)

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60)					FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE					COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
											RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
	1	2	3	4	NR	1	2	3	4	5		
187.1 Provide special counseling and assistance						50.0	42.9	7.1	0	0		
						N = 14						
188.0 Loss of hearing which is often accompanied by paranoid behavior and/or withdrawal resulting in little or no classroom participation and poor attendance	13.5	26.9	42.3	17.3	8						188.0 (4)	188.0 (6)
188.1 Provide special counseling and assistance						50.0	35.7	7.1	7.1	0		
						N = 14						
189.0 Inability to compete on all levels without special assistance in order to overcome feelings of inadequacy and the emotional problems and frustrations that their special problems cause	11.5	26.9	50.0	11.5	8						189.0 (4)	189.0 (3)
190.0 Family members who provide more assistance than is needed for self improvement	14.8	37.0	35.2	13.0	6						190.0 (4) There is a lack of knowledge in overprotection. Student needs self reliance which can be gained through rational behavior training and assertiveness to deal with over-bearing parents.	190.0 (3)
190.1 Administrators and instructors can work with families to overcome these barriers.						7.1	50.0	21.4	21.4	0		
						N = 14						
190.2 Provide counseling and education for the family						16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	0		
						N = 12						
191.0 Lack of support and encouragement from the family	17.0	22.6	47.2	13.2	7						191.0 (3)	191.0 (4)
191.1 Provide family counseling						28.6	35.7	28.6	7.1	0		
						N = 14						
191.2 Separate the student from the family						7.7	30.8	15.4	15.4	30.8		
						N = 13						
192.0 A home environment which discourages or destroys interest or initiative on the part of the student	23.1	28.8	40.4	7.7	8						192.0 (7) Human Resources Agency, TDMH-MR Community Services still do not recognize the importance of supporting the family with other assistance other than welfare money.	192.0 (4)

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60) 1	2	3	4	NR	FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE 1	2	3	4	5	COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
192.1 Family counseling and/or removal of the student to a support environment should be implemented.						14.3	42.9	28.6	7.1	7.1 N = 14		
193.0 Family members who adhere to myths and misconceptions of handicapping conditions	20.8	28.3	39.6	11.3	7						193.0 (2) There should be required courses for parents. Well-meaning over protection results from lack of knowledge.	193.0 (5)
193.1 Provide for family counseling						28.6	35.7	28.6	0	7.1 N = 14		
194.0 Lack of emotional support from significant "others" in social life of the handicapped, i.e., need for sustained encouragement	15.4	40.4	36.5	7.7	8						194.0 (2) On-going support should be provided by rehabilitation counselors and peer counselors on the campus.	194.0 (3)
194.1 Use of halfway houses						14.3	42.9	14.3	7.1	21.4 N = 14		
194.2 Provide counseling on a regularly scheduled basis.						35.7	35.7	28.6	0	0 N = 14		
195.0 Some disabled people also have disabled spouses which put an additional burden on the person.	5.5	20.0	45.5	29.1	5						195.0 (1)	195.0 (4)
Barriers within Advocates for Handicapped Persons												
196.0 Lack of public, administrative, and parental support to encourage handicapped persons to attend technical programs.	15.8	29.8	47.4	7.0	3						196.0 (5) This is a big key and a major barrier--publicity and legislation is needed. The open door must be swung wider and the welcome mat put down.	196.0 (2)
196.1 Offer a course in Secondary and Post-Secondary schools (for credit) on the subject of "Acceptance of and Victory Over Handicaps". Let all interested students take the course.						26.7	33.3	40.0	0	0 N = 15		
196.2 Provide for family involvement and training.						20.0	33.3	40.0	6.7	0 N = 15		

BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	SEVERITY OF BARRIER RATING BY PERCENTAGE (N = 60) 1 2 3 4 NR	FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY PERCENTAGE 1 2 3 4 5	COMMENTS REGARDING RATING OF SEVERITY OF BARRIERS	
			RATED TOO LOW (Numbers of Respondents)	RATED TOO HIGH (Numbers of Respondents)
197.0 Inadequate assistance and support which results in fear of entering the world of training and the world of work.	12.3 47.4 36.8 3.5 3		197.0 (2) This is a realistic fear which can be eliminated through counseling and Human Development courses.	197.0 (2)
197.1 Provide emotional support through counseling and other students.		37.5 50.0 12.5 0 0 N = 16		
197.2 Establish top priorities for rehabilitation services to provide support for handicapped students in early years of training and job experience.		28.6 35.7 35.7 0 0 N = 14		
198.0 Goals which are established by peers and society rather than the individual	27.6 27.6 37.9 6.9 2		198.0 (7) Peers have an unusual influence on an individual's decision-making for life.	198.0 (2)
198.1 Provide student directed counseling		53.3 33.3 13.3 0 0 N = 15		
198.2 Public and private agencies should make more effort to educate the general public.		62.5 37.5 0 0 0 N = 8		